The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CX NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 5, 1920 No. 2866

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 741

EDITORIALS:

- The Republican Convention 744
- A Federal Budget: Possibilities and Impossibilities 745
- Press Agenting the Lord 746
- The Unhappy Farmer 747

HIRAM W. JOHNSON. By Oswald Garrison Villard 748

FOR HOOVER. By Robert Herrick 750

BACK TO LIBERTY. By Joseph Irwin France 751

DARK HORSES AND WHITE HOPES 753

HENRY ALLEN'S INDUSTRIAL COURT. By Frank P. Walsh 755

THE REPUBLICANS AND THE BLACK VOTER. By W. E. Burghardt DuBois 757

MICHAELS STERN & CO. VS. THE AMALGAMATED. By Anne Hamilton Coolidge 759

THE ARMENIAN MANDATE. By Lewis Einstein 762

CIVILIZATION VS. FOOD SUPPLY. By Orin Crooker 764

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 765

CORRESPONDENCE 765

EVEN AS HERE. By Jeannette Marks 766

BOOKS:

- Our Russian Policy. By Norman Hapgood 766
- Lovers and Loathers of Erin. By Preserved Smith 768
- Stabilizing the Dollar. By Carl C. Plehn 769
- Mercier. By Muriel Harris 770
- Our National Parks. By Frederick S. Dellenbaugh 771
- All That Glitters 771
- Books in Brief 772

DRAMA: Jangled Lives. By Ludwig Lewisohn 774

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 776

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

WILLIAM MACDONALD FREDA KIRCHWEY

ARTHUR WARNER ARTHUR GLEASON

LEWIS S. GANNETT

ERNEST H. GRUENING, MANAGING EDITOR

CARL VAN DOREN, LITERARY EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

FIRST the million-dollar baby, then the million-dollar tenor, and now the million-dollar candidate for the Republican nomination. Thus does Leonard Wood take his seat among the immortals next to John Nicholas Brown and Enrico Caruso. His fame is now secure; every future edition of Stanwood's "History of Presidential Elections" will contain a record of this amazing campaign fund which has just been revealed by the Senate investigation in Washington. It ought also to record the fact that this revelation of a good-natured, big business man's desire to purchase the nomination for a friend succeeded in defeating the latter. It was Borah, we believe, who said that Governor Lowden could not ride to the White House on a Pullman pass; we do not believe that General Wood can attain the same goal on cakes of Ivory soap, no matter how well they float, or how pure they be. To the average, unsophisticated American there could be no more glaring proof of the unfitness of Leonard Wood for the high office to which he aspires than his willingness to be thus staked by Mr. Procter and his associates. We note that the General is careful to say that if he is elected Mr. Procter's efforts on his behalf will have no effect on him whatsoever. Those are brave words, but they are also the words of a political tyro, and presuppose a more than human quality in General Wood. Could anyone quite forget the $500,000 check which underwrote one's successful campaign for high office? What General Wood is too dull to perceive is that his permitting such a gift is in itself a scandal of the first magnitude; at least Governor Lowden would be in debt to himself alone if his slush fund of $414,000 should buy him the prize.

THE last two primaries of importance have both resulted in a further set-back for General Wood. Senator Johnson carried Oregon by a plurality of 2,158 and Senator Sutherland carried his home State of West Virginia by 5,000 votes. The Johnson victory in Oregon is the more noteworthy because the managers of the other candidates, after having made vigorous campaigns, toward the close advised their own followers to combine to beat Johnson. The political gossips continue to figure how many delegates Johnson and Wood will have on the first ballot and how many of their delegates will break away and to whom on the second ballot. Figuring of this sort is idle. It is, for instance, too early to tell what effect the revelations of the huge size of the Wood fund will have upon his standing in the convention. As for the Democrats, they are more at sea than ever. The best political correspondents in Washington are agreed that McAdoo cannot be nominated, both because of the stand which Mr. Wilson has taken on the treaty and because of the President's relationship to Mr. McAdoo. Palmer is impossible, which leaves, among the men so far most talked of, only Governor Edwards and Governor Cox.

IF a Mexican sub-committee, after sitting for some months on the far side of the Rio Grande, should issue a report frankly recommending to its Government the overthrow of the Constitution of the United States as the price of Mexican friendship and urging as an alternative armed intervention to establish the sort of government and constitution most pleasing to Mexico, it might be taken amiss by serious-minded persons on this side of the border. They might say it was impudent of Mexico to propose, under threat of war, to rewrite our Constitution. They might say it was none of Mexico's business. And they would be quite right. Mexico, probably, will not have the strength or the courage to make the obvious retort to Senator Fall, who in his report to the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs has made just such recommendations regarding the treatment of Mexico by the United States. Unfortunately for Mexico, it can probably better afford to scrap its Constitution than to risk intervention and ultimate annexation by the United States. Life and some sort of liberty are doubtless dearer to it than its ancient rights over its subsoil deposits or its freedom to legislate as it pleases. It appears likely from recent reports that the present Mexican Government is ready to barter those rights to American finance and rewrite its Constitution in deeds if not in words.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANOTHER triumph for publicity was recorded when the Army bill came out of conference without its most obnoxious clause, that providing for automatic conscription whenever the President deemed that a "national emergency" was at hand. The danger of the drafting of labor in strikes in time of peace is thus ended. Almost equally gratifying is the striking out of the bill of the provision for voluntary universal training of our youth at summer camps—which the Senate substituted for its original plan of introducing universal compulsory service—and abandonment of the plan to federalize the National Guard. On the other hand, the bill increases the regular army to 280,000 men, plus the organization of an enlisted reserve corps liable for fifteen days' service a year. The officers' caste is enlarged to 17,000—more than double the existing strength and considerably larger than the force of both regular and emergency officers now in service. The United States Army has always been the most over-officered in the world, and this makes it more than ever top-heavy. Such an increase does not mean efficiency. It means that the officers will be falling over each other, that a comparatively small number will serve with troops, and that the creation of sinecures and totally unnecessary details will go on. There are to be no less than 21 major generals and 46 brigadiers. A separate air force is created of 16,000 men and 1,514 officers headed by a major general. This is the greatest peace-time increase in officers the country has ever seen—and comes after the war to end war and to safeguard democracy!

GREAT BRITAIN continues to show a most admirable spirit in the matter of her Navy. Thus the London *Telegraph*, which is anything but liberal or anti-imperialistic, calls attention in an editorial to the fact that "for the first time for centuries we have not a single capital ship of any description in hand, and no vessel, large or small, has been laid down in our own or in Dominion shipyards since the armistice was signed. On the other hand, eighteen battleships and battle cruisers are being built in the United States, effective construction of no small proportion having been started since the end of 1918." The *Telegraph* also brings out the fact that while the naval expenditure of Great Britain for 1918-19 was £325,000,000, for the current twelve months it is to be only £84,000,000. The *Telegraph* says that it does not write of the naval construction of the United States in a spirit of criticism, but in order to do away with the belief in some quarters that England is engaging in a competition in naval armaments with America. As a matter of fact, it adds, "we [the British] have abandoned all navy shipbuilding and armament." In a speech in New York Sir Auckland Geddes has just confirmed these facts. It is a misfortune that Congress should permit the United States to go on building additional ships of war. Mr. Wilson, too, is censurable for such unethical and wasteful expenditure, and for taking the position that if the League of Nations fails we have no alternative save to build the largest armada the world has ever seen. England is showing the same enlightened spirit as she did before the war when she offered a naval recess of a year to Germany which the militarists of the latter declined.

IT is difficult to be particularly grateful to Mr. Wilson for the release of Kate Richards O'Hare. So many people have been so long convinced of the utter injustice of her commitment and sentence that the President's action appears merely a very tardy recognition of that injustice. Nor should the matter stop there. The jails in our land of liberty hold plenty of political prisoners whose detention is no less subversive of the principles for which the rebels of the War of Independence fought. Mrs. O'Hare left behind her in prison Mollie Steimer, the young woman who is serving a fifteen year sentence for "distributing anarchistic literature." Down in Atlanta Eugene Debs is still behind prison bars. And hundreds of other less well-known men and women, put in jail for no crime except the honest expression of their convictions, known in the Constitution as "freedom of speech," are waiting to be released as such persons generally have been in France, Canada, Italy, and Germany. President Wilson did merely a small part of his duty in freeing Kate Richards O'Hare; but her husband and her four children are considerably happier for even that.

THE "Report upon the Illegal Practices of the United States Department of Justice" which has just been issued by the National Popular Government League is not the work of hysterical sentimentalists or revengeful radicals. Of the twelve signers three are professors at the Harvard Law School—Dean Roscoe Pound, Zachariah Chafee, Jr., and Felix Frankfurter—while Ernst Freund, Alfred S. Niles, and Dean Tyrrell Williams are professors at the law schools of the University of Chicago, the University of Maryland, and Washington University, respectively. The remaining signers are R. G. Brown of Memphis, Swinburne Hale of New York, Francis Fisher Kane of Philadelphia, Jackson H. Ralston of Washington, D. C., David Wallerstein of Philadelphia, and Frank P. Walsh of New York. The report confines itself to specifically illegal acts of the Department of Justice, without even raising the general problems of free speech and free press. All the more blistering, then, does the indictment seem. That A. Mitchell Palmer's agents have, with his support and encouragement, been brutal, cowardly, and dastardly is one thing, though a fearful thing for decent Americans to have to admit. It is another that these same agents have wantonly and repeatedly broken the law they have so prated about upholding. They are charged with inflicting cruel and unusual punishments, with making arrests without warrant and unreasonable searches and seizures, with using agents provocateurs, with compelling accused persons to be witnesses against themselves, and with carrying on a deliberate propaganda against radicalism as a part of the activities of the Attorney-General. The charges are atrocious, as the facts have been right along. *The Nation* has given large publicity to such illegal practices already, and in a later issue will deal further with this report. For the present it is sufficient to remind Americans that under A. Mitchell Palmer we have been administering "justice," and are still administering it, with the infamous and impudent disregard of human rights which the world has rightly laid at the doors of Spain and Russia as their greatest shames—and, when too long persisted in, as causing their downfall.

MR. WILSON'S veto of the Knox peace resolution, expected as it was, is not important except as it further reveals the President's isolation from the thought of the country and illustrates the ineffectiveness of a form of government in which the executive and legislative functions are separate. The same day that Mr. Wilson vetoed the Sen-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ate's peace resolution that body as coolly rejected his proposal to accept a mandate for Armenia. With the differences that now exist between Congress and the President we can have no foreign policy and the country must simply drift until the end of the Wilson Administration. If, on the other hand, American public affairs were controlled by the more direct and democratic method of a cabinet, part of and responsible to the legislature, we might hope to get on. Mr. Wilson has ceased to be President in so far as that implies political leadership of the country, and it will be written down as one of the tragedies of history that a man who—with the possible exception of Mr. Roosevelt—had become more of a world figure than any previous American President was ignored and without influence a year before his term in office ended.

SIR AUCKLAND GEDDES is a cheerful person to have around in a world full of cares. He began his ambassadorship by showing us we need not worry about Ireland, as that annoying place was a strictly British concern. He now removes oil from the troubled waters of international controversy. Under his deft manipulation we learn that the United States has most of the oil of the world and that Britain controls so tiny a portion of the producing oil fields as not to be worth mention among gentlemen. This is much as if a banker pleaded penury for his bank because the gold in his vaults was not such a lot. By omitting Britain's potential supplies, and by scoring up America's rapidly exhausting supplies, Sir Auckland makes his after-dinner case. British policy at this time does not concern itself primarily with producing oil. British policy, as Sir E. Mackay Edgar says, is to sit tightly on several potential oil fields of the world. It uses the method of the Marathon runner and lets the United States sprint itself to death on the first mile.

IT is to be hoped that the proposal of an American mandate for Armenia is permanently disposed of in spite of Mr. Wilson's urgency and the Allies' desires. The Allies' case for the acceptance of such a burden by the United States is well put by the New York *Times'* Paris correspondent. The Allies would welcome, he says, "the presence of thirty thousand or forty thousand American troops in Armenia," which would assume the task of "stabilizing" Turkish affairs, "put Mustapha Kemal out," provide "an American military barrier against the entrance of the Bolsheviki into Turkey," make "a stable state" out of Armenia, and maintain against its enemies "the boundaries Mr. Wilson would lay out." Lest this should seem too inconsiderable a task for a red-blooded race, the *Times* points out the reasons for "the wholesome influence American troops would have in Asia Minor."

> Mustapha Kemal is holding his independent parliament at Angora and explaining why he will not recognize the Sultan's authority, since the Sultan is under the British thumb at Constantinople. . . . At Constantinople yesterday, when the Government began the consideration of the treaty terms, 5,000 Turks took part in a demonstration against it. East of Smyrna Turkish regulars are fighting Greeks. The Nationalists of Thrace declare that they will oppose by force the Greek occupation which is about to begin. The French are having their own troubles in Syria, and over in Persia the British have to fall back before the Soviet troops of Red Russia. Georgia and Azerbaijan are said to be half-way Bolshevist, and Red propaganda is being pushed in Armenia. Kemal says that before the treaty is signed he will have occupied all the Asiatic side of the Straits, and to enforce their treaty the Allies would have to make him get out. Over Trebizond, which Wilson believes should be Armenia's port, Kemal's officials hold sway.

This about covers the case for our acceptance of the mandate, except for the not unimportant items of administrative expense and the fact that Armenia is a barren country of small resources and great distances, in which a large part of the population is made up of war-like tribes whose one point of unanimity seems to be an active hate of the Armenians.

AS for the Armenians themselves, who, despairing of help from any other Power, turn to the United States as their last hope, there is no certainty that our intervention in the uplands of Asia Minor would really better their lot. American missionaries have done the Armenians a poor service in accepting at face value the extravagant territorial claims which have tended to discredit the new republic. The machine guns and French 75's mounted in the American missionary compound at Marash did not help the Armenians of that city. Nor is the recent record of the United States as a colonial administrator such as to encourage the hope that our military intervention in a country whose inhabitants have darker skins than our own would contribute to their happiness. In Haiti and Santo Domingo, in Nicaragua and Mexico, wherever American arms have gone to pacify and restore order, tyranny and rebellion have ensued. If Armenia is to be saved it will not be by thirty thousand or forty thousand American soldiers. An Armenia of moderate boundaries under the protection of the League of Nations, supervised by an international commission—this might be possible. The alternative is either to leave Armenia under Turkish rule or to allow an Armenian alliance with Soviet Russia. What is the Allies' choice?

"I AM the President of the French Republic," said the President of the French Republic who, fallen from the window of his train, had been walking the railroad track in unflattering but not unfluttering insufficiency of costume. "And I," said Lotty the trackwalker, "am the Czar of Russia"—or words to that effect. How the classics repeat themselves! An ancient situation, set forth in a thousand anecdotes, brings again the classic, inevitable repartee. And the moral? The President of the French Republic, being without his official attributes of staff and bodyguard and ringing bells, merely because he is *sans culotte* looks and seems sansculotte. His grandeur inheres, as with Thackeray's little king and Carlyle's forked radish, in coat, shirt, trousers. It is admirably French that the President of the French Republic should so well have kept up the classical tradition. But, characteristically, the episode has also those novel elements that go with a creative use of the classics. The President of the French Republic has discovered a new incognito. No longer need the rulers of the world go as plain John Smith or William Jones when they are about their private business. Let them put on pajamas (or pyjamas, as their orthography demands) and cut off down the railroad track. No one will guess. And the President of the French Republic has brought another novelty into his episode. We believe now that he is the rightful President of the French Republic. What other man or woman, native or outlander, has ever been able to open the window of a French railway coach wide enough to be able to fall through it?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Republican Convention

THAT the Republican Convention promises to be more interesting than any in recent years is due, first, to the failure of any candidate to reach Chicago with an impressive number of delegates, and, second, to the promise of hard fighting on the part of Senator Johnson and the survivors of the Progressive movement of eight years ago. It was the misfortune of that movement to have tied itself up entirely to the personality of a single, ambitious man. When Mr. Roosevelt found that he could not use the new party as a vehicle to land himself at the White House, he abandoned it and it collapsed. Had its existence been continued, we should have had the machinery ready-made for a liberal third party movement. Undoubtedly, the new alignments due to the war would have altered its membership. But the fact is that those who are now seeking to form a third party are handicapped because they have no machinery, no outstanding figure to nominate, and no single outstanding issue to champion, like that of slavery, which brought the Republican Party into existence.

That party today faces a triumphant return to power next fall if it plays its cards well—this much is surely obvious. The greatest obstacle to any progressive or liberal development at Chicago is the consciousness of this fact. So widespread is the reaction against Mr. Wilson and his dictatorship that even a Wood or a Lowden could probably win hands down. Yet sure things have been lost ere this by overconfidence and can be again. There are limits beyond which even Republicans cannot go this year. There is the economic situation, for instance. Various prophets look for an early and severe financial crisis and much unemployment. If anything like this happens before the election, and there is even a weak third ticket in the field, we may see startling surprises. But at present the Old Guard have a right to their belief that they can nominate anybody and "get away with it." Should Mr. Johnson, or a liberal like Senator France, be chosen, we shall have an interesting campaign. But, even with men of this type as standard-bearers, there would be little to encourage those who realize that radical reforms are necessary; that it is time to make over the Constitution; that the world-old battle of privilege and prerogative against liberty, of popular rights against property rights, is entering its most acute phase. The Lodges and Penroses and Cranes believe that America can still be governed just as it was in 1914; that we are going to come out of the world's greatest tragedy to do business precisely as before; that the existing ferment is entirely ephemeral; that labor will soon settle down and be good again, particularly if it is chastened by a period of hard times, of scarce food, and of unemployment.

If we believed as much, we should confess to despair of America's progress during the next few years. But whatever the outcome at Chicago, the forces that have been unleashed, and the thoughts that have been freed by the war, will continue. The reaction toward liberalism is growing; America is coming out of the drugging of conscience and the fettering of freedom which is the inseparable accompaniment of that barbarism known as war, whatever ideals be advanced to excuse its lies, its falsehoods, its open and stealthy blows at all those privileges which every free man should hold most dear. So, if the liberal looks for nothing good to come out of Chicago, he can content his soul with considerable patience as he watches the portents and notes social and economic developments. For it is precisely through economic developments that the change is coming. The politicians of both parties are unable to grapple with them, because they are so accustomed to regarding events only from the political point of view.

Why should anybody believe that the Republican Party could rise at Chicago to the crisis of the hour? It is still the party of wealth and privilege; the great corporation managers are its mainstays and they rejoice that, as they think, the war has healed the split between the conservatives and the old Progressive Republican faction save for troublesome Johnson. Their party is still imperialistic, like the Democratic. If it is a little more opposed to entangling foreign alliances than the Democratic, it is as willing to gobble up our Caribbean neighbors, while hypocritically making war on behalf of the rights of small nationalities. The Republican platform bids fair to be as completely banal, as full of glittering generalities as the Democratic—unless Johnson and Borah prevent—and both platforms will be devoid of any real issues. So far as can be foreseen, there will be nothing to choose between them. The Republicans will, of course, be able to "view with alarm" and "earnestly denounce" the acts of the Wilson Administration with greater gusto and far greater truth than is usually the case when politicians criticize their opponents. But there is little to choose between the two parties. The political system of the past is collapsing under their eyes, yet neither knows it. They are determined to see nothing but the existing order, and it will be the holders of the purse strings like Mr. Gary who will shape the policies. If Senator Johnson is early disposed of, the candidate will, as usual, be chosen by a few men in a star-chamber, to go forth as another miracle of our representative system, and as the choice of the members of the great Republican Party, while the party press will hail the standard-bearer as another peerless leader and the platform as a true expression of all our national desires.

We are not of those, like one of our contemporaries, who hope the Republicans will be just as reactionary as possible and nominate a Wood or a Harding. Such persons wish the old order to be its worst, on the theory that matters will have to be much worse before there is any radical change, before the possessors of special privileges can be made to let go their throttle-hold. It is a comfortable belief and an easily-voiced desire. But it means a more violent convulsion when the change comes and much more suffering meanwhile, with perhaps much additional wrongdoing in international affairs. Surely, it is rather the duty of the patriot and the liberal to look for and pray for signs of gradual reform, even in the ranks of the reactionaries. Hence *The Nation* would be glad to see a triumph of the progressive forces at Chicago, even if these must still continue to wear the chains of party servitude and of corporation control. Richard Cobden rightly believed that the interests of the individual, those of the nation, and those of all nations are identical, and that they are in entire accordance with the higher interests of morality, and with this belief, as Lord Welby puts it, "an economic truth acquired with him the dignity and vitality of a moral law." How earnestly we wish that the Republican Convention might deal with national and international problems in this spirit!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Federal Budget: Possibilities and Impossibilities

THE business man who runs his own business on a highly centralized plan learns with surprise that the government, regarded as a business enterprise, is highly decentralized. Then without stopping to inquire whether government should or should not be regarded as a business enterprise, or whether decentralization may not be a desirable feature in government, he jumps to the conclusion that centralization of government is sound business. Having reached this point, it seems perfectly easy to make still another *non sequitur* and to conclude that a budget system will at once centralize and business-ize government.

We have before us a report by a committee of a great chamber of commerce which gives the disjointed argument for a federal budget in typical form. We paraphrase: "Something over 240 departments, sub-departments, and bureaus prepare plans of their respective desires and needs quite irrespective of what any other department is doing. All of these multifarious plans and estimates are placed in the hands of various Congressional committees for consideration and action without the aid of experts to analyze them, and Congress is expected to combine all these plans and estimates in an intelligent whole—an impossible task under the methods now employed. Hence a National Budget Bureau is the *only* practical method of accomplishing efficient and business-like administration in Washington." Then to clinch the argument it is pointed out "that Great Britain for two hundred years has had a successful budget system." All that is needed, therefore, to save "millions and even billions of dollars" is a budget law.

Is the matter so amazingly simple as all this? Will one little law, one new bureau added to the 240 bureaus, do all this? Lest we be misunderstood, we hasten to say that we are very much in favor of saving money, be it billions or even millions, and that we readily believe that a budget system of any sort is a desideratum. But we are also sure that the matter is by no means so simple as is assumed. We had a budget commission under President Taft which furnished some very interesting data for scholars to study and editors to write about. Many States have budget laws. The budgets written under these laws can be found in the State archives by industrious librarians. It is safe to say that of about 2,000 such budgets reported to State legislatures in the past one hundred years not fifty have shaped legislation directly. It would be a high estimate to say that one hundred had even an indirect influence.

One very vital fact is usually overlooked. We cannot have a European budget system without a complete change in our system of government. The European budget is prepared by a "government," or executive branch, which is identical with the party in power in the parliament. It speaks and carries out the will of parliament. But we in the United States have established and jealously guard complete separation of the executive and the legislative branches of government. Whether the time has come when we should substitute for a President elected by the people an administration or government by the majority in a reconstructed House of Representatives is a question far larger than the budget. It involves matters more important than dollars, even billions of dollars. But, as things stand, centralization and a European budget are impossibilities. What we can have, however, is a budget which will afford a systematic oversight of revenues and expenditures and by force of light and publicity will influence action. Such a budget may be prepared by: (1) an executive bureau, (2) a legislative committee, or (3) by a bureau presumed to stand between the executive and the legislative. The first is our old scheme which experience has shown soon results in a paper budget which nobody reads unless, as shown below, it emanates from a board of control; the second is weak because of the constantly changing membership of the legislature and hence of the committee; and the last is likely to fall as between two stools. No one of these plans will deprive the Congressman of his right to introduce either new spending or new taxation.

While we cannot have a policy-fixing budget, there is no reason why we cannot have economy. Some of our States have led the way in achieving a large part of the advantages aimed at by the budget proponents without changing or straining our form of government. That is by the system of control. Congress itself recognized the principle when it organized the old and notorious pension system. State boards of control differ from our traditional auditors in two ways. The auditor is concerned merely with the legality of an expenditure or a collection; the board of control inquires into its wisdom and economy as well. The auditor generally acts after the expenditure has been made; the board of control before it is consummated. The best of these boards do not concern themselves so much with petty items of expenditures as they do with general rules aimed to ensure sound methods and to bring the best judgment of officials to bear on the problems. To illustrate, the legislature makes an appropriation for mothers' pensions and outlines the general scope of the law. The officials charged with administering the relief are subject to the supervision of the board of control. That board lays down the rules which the administering officials must follow in the selection of cases and the granting of funds. In like manner the board directs the apportionment of State school money, determining what standards must be met in each school in order to carry out the purpose and intent of the law. The board of control may be empowered to establish a central purchasing bureau for supplies for all State departments and institutions.

Such is the natural aptitude of American people and of their officials, if given a chance, for sound business methods that these boards by conference with officials and after experience have rapidly developed sound practices. They soon get to know what is going on in every department and by reason of their direct contact with officials and with spending have the kind of knowledge which commands respect. They come inevitably to balance the needs and desires of one department against those of others. Whether specifically entrusted with the making and submission of a budget, or not, their recommendations do have great weight. They have introduced system and economy where it was lacking before.

It seems in the light of this experience that "the saving of billions" is much more likely to be brought about by control than by any of the proposed budget systems. A bureau of experts sitting aloft and criticizing the officers who are in the thick of the work is too likely to become a board of closet philosophers. But a board of control, re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sponsible for the wise expenditure of money to accomplish the wishes of the legislature, and which reports: "The money you appropriated for workmen's compensation will be more effective to the end you had in view, if you will make such and such changes in the law," is listened to and commands respect. The underlying reason why the British budget works is not to be found in the accuracy of the "estimates," nor in the eloquence of the Chancellor's speech, but in the fact that the Government knows whereof it speaks from actual control of both expenditures and collections. A budget which is not based on control is sure to be more ornamental than useful.

What has been said above applies directly to expenditures. The matter is similar in the field of taxation, although the two may not be combined. "Billions lost in uncollected income and profits taxes," said the newspaper headlines a while ago. "Because," say the Treasury officials, "we have a force inadequate to do the work." Good taxation is one-tenth law and nine-tenths administration. State tax commissions have taken the old general property tax, once held to be a hopelessly bad tax, and made it work. When the British Board of Inland Revenue makes a recommendation its word commands the respect of Parliament because the Board "knows how." The Federal government has no bureau of assessment, but is trying to collect vast sums in direct taxes with the machinery developed for hunting down moonshiners. There's a new building on Lafayette Square in Washington which houses the income tax officials. It should house a real Board of Direct Taxation.

All this is theoretical. But it is sound theory and has been proven to be practical. What can be more visionary than the McCormick-Good bill, sent by the House of Representatives to President Wilson on May 29, which calls for an artist to paint, in seven panels, allegorical pictures of a budget heaven in which only a saintly Congress could dwell?

Press Agenting The Lord

"YOU'VE seen the Interchurch advertising. It reached your eyes, but has it reached your heart?"

If we have a heart, that advertising reached it—particularly the poster which reveals the faces of America's master minds, Babson, Schwab, Josephus Daniels. They have a friendly look which recalls other national types, such as Mennen, Munyon, the Brothers Smith and W. L. Douglas. The half-page displays of the Interchurch World Movement have translated the life of the spirit into American business terms. They show that:

Jesus was an advertiser.

"Jesus gave the Church its advertising instructions and program: 'Go ye into all the world.'"

He built the foundations of the great businesses of America.

"Have you ever stopped to think what business owes to Christ?"

"The Church has taken a leaf from successful business."

Roger Babson sends his ringing message: "Let us business men get behind the churches and their preachers. For upon them the value of all we own ultimately depends."

"You are a stockholder in the greatest business in the world."

"All that makes property safe in the world is bound up in the reverence for law that religion breeds."

"Put a church in a town and all real estate values increase."

Jesus safeguards property. He quiets industrial unrest. If business men are secure in their profits, "think what labor owes to Him. Faith, good old-fashioned faith—that's what the world needs most."

"Until his thirtieth year the Master was the Carpenter of Nazareth. Could the men who labor with their hands ever be far from His thought and prayers?"

"Sons of God—brothers of their rulers and employers, with an equal right to happiness, to comfort and opportunity. Help to make industry a spiritual enterprise."

"What is the cure for the world's present troubles? Legislation? Industrial compromises? Political readjustments? We've tried them all, and they do not satisfy. We're hungry and thirsty for Faith. The world needs 'a genuine religious revival.'"

From the *Literary Digest* we learn that many of August Fegert's ideas have been used in furthering the Interchurch World Movement. Mr. Fegert is known as the "Lord's Press Agent," who introduced the "Gospel Smile." At a Christian Endeavor convention he collected five pious pippins to smile into a camera, and a Chicago newspaper featured the picture with a seven-column head: "The Gospel Smile." He put pep into Good Friday. The *Christian Herald* tells the story:

> Fegert strolled into the office of the man who was running about 25 "Y" huts in camps and said: "What are you doing for Good Friday?"
>
> "Nothing," was the reply.
>
> "What?" said Fegert. "If it was the Fourth of July we'd have everything from parades to barbecues. Here's just as much a great big anniversary and you aren't doing a thing. At least ask the men in each hut to be silent for three minutes before the regular evening entertainment, and then let some one offer a short prayer." This was a simple idea, but it got into all the newspapers.

A few years ago the talk was all of "red-blooded muscular Christianity." Big "he-men" were signing up for the life of sacrifice. Now the appeal is to results, success, money, hustle. The *Continent* has been offended by this advertising language. It says:

> The overtone of all appeals which today so ambitiously call the Church to get at its world tasks on a big scale is the assumption that if people will only give plenty of money, everything that Christianity ought to do for mankind will be done straight off. Of course no Christian really believes cash will save the world. But that only makes more glaringly apparent the epidemic obsession which for the time being loads all tongues with "the calm talk of billions" in Church circles just as in business offices. Many do not hesitate to announce that with the new vigor introduced into religion by the modern American school of hustle, the aims of the Church will now be realized with a victorious dash electrifying humanity.

Certain other Presbyterians have protested. John Willis Baer, ex-moderator of the General Assembly, is quoted thus: "If this movement had been successful in a monetary way, its very success would have been a great problem. We have come to believe that the leadership in this movement just now is of the plunging type."

Finally, on May 27, feeling among Presbyterians at the General Assembly came to a focus, and they voted themselves out of the Interchurch World Movement. As a sop to the promoters, they maintain an advisory relationship with the work. They had discovered, in the words of Mr. Baer, that "there is one denomination that has been named first,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and an individual who has been named second as preferential creditors, which would mean that if the Interchurch Movement failed as a business concern, this one denomination and this one individual would have to be paid first." A correspondent of the New York *Times* guesses at the Interchurch debt as $9,600,000, at the "one denomination" as the Baptist Church North, and the "one individual" as John D. Rockefeller, Jr. The Interchurch replies that all preferential claims were recently waived. The movement has staked all on its appeal to business men. The next year will show whether business men consider organized institutional religion essential.

The Unhappy Farmer

RIGHT into the midst of these glorious spring days, when every city-locked worker is homesick for the earth from which he sprang, and the hardest-boiled business man is nursing a secret ambition to chuck it all and become a tiller of the soil, some stupid statisticians have seen fit to plump an array of figures which tend to show that all is not well down on the farm. On close inspection this plaint of the statisticians proves to be our old friend, the "farm crisis," which reappears once every so often, like eczema or the seven-year locusts. The "farm crisis" is considerably overdue, and doubtless would have been here before had it not been for our preoccupation with the war, but it does seem needlessly cruel to synchronize it with rhubarb, dandelions, and other reminders of spring fields and pastures.

The worst of it is that the "farm crisis" is true—has been as far back as we can remember. The young folks have been leaving the farms for so many years now that it is a wonder there are still farms to leave. Almost every journalist came from a farm originally (he would not have the stamina for the job otherwise), and every editor plans to return to the land some day and get rich raising chickens or apples. He is deterred from starting next Saturday not by his total ignorance of agriculture, but by a stray thought at the last minute of how horrid it would be to have to get up cold winter mornings to do the milking. Meanwhile, he makes up for his procrastination by printing articles telling the farmer how much better off he is than the tired business man of the city. The farmer, and especially the farm laborer, does not believe this doctrine any more than the editor himself does, and keeps right on coming to the city to "see life"; and so we get back to the statisticians, and, between the May Day labor scare and the midsummer sea serpent, find our newspapers occupied with the fact that since last year there has been a decline of 23 per cent in the acreage of winter wheat in the United States, while the number of farm workers is only 72 per cent of what it was two years ago. At the same time, a field agent of the United States Bureau of Crop Estimates, who has been making a survey of Michigan, reports that almost one and three-quarter million acres of farm lands, 8.74 per cent, are idle this year.

These conditions are accurately described in the newspapers as "alarming." But nobody is, in fact, alarmed. The public is surrounded with so many alarming conditions these days that it does not seriously disturb itself over anything less violent than a collision with a Mogul freight locomotive. Besides, the "farm crisis" is too old a story. For fifty years the drift from the country to the city has been a pronounced tendency in American civilization. Some persons thought this drift had been successfully dammed by giving the farmer the automobile or the trolley, and the telephone, rural free delivery of mail, and the movies, but statistics lead to no such conclusion. The urban population of the United States (persons living in places of 2,500 or more inhabitants), was 36 per cent according to the census of 1890. By 1900 it had increased to 40, and by 1910 to 46 per cent; there is every reason to believe that the present census will show a continuation of this tendency. This drift does not necessarily mean a food shortage, as most of the commentators on the recently published figures suggest. It is, of course, unfortunate in the present situation of the world that any possible food supply should be reduced for the next few years, but if in the long run America can make itself more useful to the world as an industrial than as an agricultural nation, it can depend upon others for food, just as England does.

This is not to say that we should make light of the existing world food shortage, which may develop into actual famine within the next few years. But even in the contingency of a world famine America would probably get along better than most other nations, largely because of her ability to outbid other peoples with the wealth she has acquired through her manufacturing industries. This, of course, is viewing the matter from a purely selfish standpoint, but it is the inevitable sequence of economic facts. In modern civilization manufacturing nations have generally had the best of it, even in respect to food that other peoples raised; just as the city has fared better than the country, even in regard to its table which the farmer supplies.

The real question, therefore, is not how fast we are leaving the farm for the city, but what we are doing when we get to the latter. Are we creating a civilization that is saner, nobler, and more just than that which it is superseding? There seems to be increasing uneasiness that we are not; that the city is in part, at least, abnormal and unhealthy and is not turning out better men and women than we used to grow in the country. It is no excuse to point to the degraded conditions that now exist in some rural communities. Nothing else is to be expected when the cream of the population is skimmed to supply the cities. The cities must stand or fall according to their own merits. Thus it becomes, finally, not the "farm crisis," but the city crisis. The popular theory that the better we make the city the worse the farm will become is certainly erroneous. Once we begin to make city life what it ought to be, country life will take care of itself. The "farm crisis," the servant problem, the labor shortage, the housing question are all one: dissatisfaction with an industrial system that has probably lived its day and is beginning to disintegrate.

In the interval of reorganization we have little faith in automobiles or telephones or rural free delivery or the movies to meet the "farm crisis." We have little faith in "back to the land" drives, which hitherto have resulted in nothing but raising a crop of lecturers, demonstrators, and writers for those who are still on the farms to feed. We envisage conditions of real suffering and want before the city crisis, and thus the "farm crisis" turns for the better. We believe with Senator Kenyon that sheer need may shortly send men back to the soil. And it will not be the worst thing that could happen to America if some of us whose minds have become calloused in proportion as our hands have grown soft are driven, like Father Adam, to wrest a living direct from the earth in the sweat of our faces.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hiram W. Johnson

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

WITH many others, I confess to having acquired a considerable prejudice against Hiram Johnson during the Progressive campaign because of his attacks upon Mr. Taft. They were vitriolic, savage, at times even brutal. They were always in extremely bad taste, and I could not then and do not now believe that the case of President Taft called for the expenditure of so much sound and fury. In that campaign, Mr. Johnson was obviously a narrow partisan unwilling to give credit where it was due, and some credit did belong to Mr. Taft. When I visited California in 1918 careful inquiry of different men of varying minds and politics established the fact beyond doubt that as Governor of California, Hiram Johnson had, in most unusual degree, won the good will of most Californians whose opinions are worth having. The usual belief was that he had made an admirable Governor of the State. There are those who charge him with having degraded the State by padding pay-rolls, multiplying the number of public offices, putting no less than thirty-seven editors on the salary list to further his own political ambitions, and in other ways largely increasing the cost of government. To assay the justice of all these criticisms would take the ability of a Supreme Court justice in examining evidence and months of study. Undoubtedly, Hiram Johnson is a politician and not a political idealist in practice. He plays the political game, and he often takes his positions according to the way the political wind blows best for his interests. But if that were the whole story, California would not have elected him Senator by three hundred thousand majority.

Even his enemies admit that he is a man of great power and force of character. They sneer at his attainments as a lawyer and declare that his success with juries was largely due to that very ability to attack his opponents with most violent abuse and denunciation. This, they claim, is responsible for his winning so many cases. Even these opponents, however, do not deny that under his administration many constructive measures were enacted into law; that he showed great interest in efficient management and did much to advance the social welfare of the State. Of course the chief debate about Senator Johnson, as about so many other men in political life, centers on the question whether he is or is not sincere. This in turn goes back to the question of just how much of a politician he is. Undoubtedly, Mr. Johnson can compromise with the best of them. He is a product of our political system, and he lives in a practical work-a-day world. Yet, to hear him speak is to believe in his fundamental honesty and in the sincerity with which he takes his stand and advocates his beliefs. I saw him soon after the Senate had voted to uphold the infamous betrayal of Shantung to the Japanese. He found it difficult to maintain his self-control. He said that he felt that if he had to go through one or two more such experiences, if he again had to see the Senate of the United States voting to turn over a great province of a friendly nation to a country explicitly pledged not to ask that very thing, he should feel like retiring forever from political life. To him the utterly discouraging feature of it was that the majority of the Senators who voted to uphold the treaty did so merely for partisan reasons. At heart they knew it was a steal and an international outrage to which America should not lend its sanction, and they admitted it in private conversation. If Hiram Johnson was not sincere then, there is no such thing as sincerity in human beings.

I believe that he has been sincere throughout the treaty fight. He had nothing to gain by taking the position that he did. At first, it was going directly against the popular current; only a few liberal organs of opinion had dared to denounce the treaty when it was published. The bulk of the American people and press accepted it as a model document, one that should be approved at once without stopping for investigation or study. Our noble President urged it; our Allies had helped to draft it. What more need be said? Anybody who criticized it must be pro-German. Indeed, the only question was whether the treaty was hard enough upon the Germans. Senator Johnson opposed it promptly and fearlessly. He saw what a miserable conglomeration of wrongdoing it was. He and the other Irreconcilables were told that it was useless for them to fight against it. In the editorial pages of the New York *World* and *Evening Post* they were repeatedly assured that their fight was utterly in vain; that they would be overwhelmed by an indignant public opinion; that they were merely a plague speedily to be brushed aside; that they were trying to get a little notoriety by nagging the great and good man in the White House. Yet, as the fight went on, the situation became entirely different, largely because of the uncompromising attitude of Senator Johnson, Senator Borah, and their associates. The real aspects of the treaty became clearer—here Keynes's book helped tremendously—and with every week of their fight they gained strength, with what result is known. The fallibility of the metropolitan editors has been finally proved by the magnificent showing which Senator Johnson has made in the primaries. Wherever he has campaigned, the plain people have turned to him as has always been the case throughout his entire career. He has been heaped with abuse by the newspapers of the East; yet he is stronger today than ever before.

We do not, of course, mean to imply by this that the grounds for Senator Johnson's opposition to the treaty coincide with those which idealistic liberals have made their own; such, for instance, as have been voiced in the columns of the liberal press. A narrow nationalism is, rather, responsible for much of his opposition to the League of Nations. He resents this League, among other reasons, because he believes it will draw us into the quarrels of the nations of Europe. On the Japanese question, as it exists on the Pacific Coast, he is violently anti-Japanese, as is practically every other politician in Oregon and California. Were he to be elected President, the question of our relations with Japan would become of even more serious moment than it is today. And in this connection it is well to remember that Johnson has the undivided and sinister allegiance of William Randolph Hearst with his chain of unscrupulous and demagogic journals. Mr. Hearst, who boasts that he made the war with Spain, is not unwilling to get the United States into war with Japan, Mexico, or England. His support has undoubtedly helped the Johnson campaign, and he will not hesitate to exact his pound of flesh. Nor should it be for-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gotten, in further estimating the character of Johnson's backing, that he is now cheek-by-jowl with his life-long foes, the old Southern Pacific crowd and the corrupt municipal rings of his home State. The California standpatters and Johnson have mutually forgiven and forgotten, though the Senator continues as unsparing in his abuse of his party reactionaries in the East as he was formerly on the Coast.

Nevertheless, despite all the criticisms, just or unjust, that are leveled against him, Senator Johnson today more nearly voices, in certain respects, the aspirations of many liberals than any other candidate. Excepting only Debs the Socialist, and France the Republican, he alone has stood up bravely and fearlessly for the right of free speech, free press, and free meeting, guaranteed by the Constitution, but almost completely destroyed under the ex-liberal Woodrow Wilson. He is steeped and rooted in these matters in the old-fashioned Americanism, without which our country cannot survive. He is a real defender of the Constitution when he denounces those officials who are every day breaching it, although solemnly sworn to uphold it. I have heard men in political life say that there are about thirty-seven counts upon which the present President of the United States could be impeached; however that may be, I should expect Senator Johnson, if elected, not only to be a Constitutional ruler but to court the fullest and freest expression of public opinion in war or in peace. He will undoubtedly disappoint liberals in many ways if he should be chosen President. (His complete side-stepping of the Mooney case is illustrative, as well as his failure to advocate woman suffrage and to denounce the California syndicalism law.) Indeed, I no longer believe that any President elected under the existing political conditions could give satisfaction to progressively-minded men and women, though a man of Cleveland's type might go far toward so doing. But, at any rate, I should feel that whatever foreign complications Senator Johnson might get us into, he would have a clear and steady vision and policy, such as they were, and would not reverse himself on every issue as has Woodrow Wilson. The Senator is passionately earnest in whatever he does, and that is why he has been gaining so rapidly. He is the only candidate in the field who has voiced something of a program and can speak on the stump with fire and enthusiasm. He stands head and shoulders above most other candidates because he feels profoundly certain wrongs in our Government and burns with indignation about them, as with the desire to right them.

It is because of this very passion for righting our wrongs that I am not ready to believe that Senator Johnson stands no chance of nomination at Chicago. The odds are against him of course. All the powers of privilege will oppose him; the absurd charge of radicalism brought against him by newspaper organs will be worked to the uttermost. The Old Guard is not for him; they have never forgiven his bolting the party with Roosevelt. He is too liberal and progressive for them—they still shudder when they remember that he advocated the recall of judges and the further extension of the referendum and the initiative. The guard will obey their masters and oppose him to the last. But it will be confronted in Johnson and his first lieutenant, Borah, with two extraordinarily able and resourceful fighters, as their long battle in the Senate has proved. These two men know the political game from A to Z; conventions they have worked and managed and profited by these many years. What makes them particularly formidable is this very passion which they are putting into their battling. They have a *cause*, whether they have assumed it sincerely or as a matter of deliberate policy, and they will plead it with a power that no other group of men will bring to the advocacy of their nominee. Compare Harding, whose keynote speech at the last convention left everybody as cold as icicles; or Lowden, spending his hundred thousands of dollars to nominate himself without having given utterance to a single ringing thought, or really having dedicated himself unselfishly to a single reform or policy; or Wood, with his calculating deliberateness, his readiness to be the beneficiary of men of great wealth and his ridiculous side-stepping of every real issue—compare such as these with the hot enthusiasm and dynamic power which Johnson will bring to the convention! If Senator Johnson really gets up to speak and appeals particularly to the Western cohorts, the unexpected may happen. For he is a forceful speaker, today vastly more effective than William J. Bryan, with almost as much punch and vigor in his utterances as Roosevelt had. One cannot look on Johnson's shrewd, kindly face and hear him speak without being affected by him, whether one believes with him or not. He is not credited with having as much political sagacity and statesmanship as Borah, nor is there as much downrightness attributed to him by the friends of both. But he is a power to be reckoned with. At least he knows something of what is going on in the world, which the others do not, and realizes that all is not well with America, and that there must be far-reaching changes.

Finally, at Chicago it is once more a struggle for mastery of economic forces. Curious as it seems, if one contrasts the convention of 1880 with the situation of today, there are striking similarities; even then it was said to be a fight between the conservatives and the progressives, between the bosses and the plain people, and the nomination of Garfield, a dark horse, was accepted as the defeat of the former. The only question today is whether the parallel will be carried still further and whether Johnson will emerge as the peoples' candidate, or some dark horse representing the other side. But let no man be deceived; even with Johnson nominated we shall not have progressed very far towards reorganization, or reform, or the peaceful reconstruction which is inevitable. The Republican Party is still the party of protection and privilege and wealth; it is still corporation-owned and dominated. No matter who is its candidate it will offer little to those genuine liberals who desire an entire recasting of the political system which made possible the incredible convulsion of the whole world in the last six years.

A. Mitchell Palmer
A Scathing Indictment by Swinburne Hale

Louis F. Post—American
By Henry R. Mussey

From the Irish Front
William MacDonald of The Nation Staff
Sends His First Dispatches

More About West Virginia
by Arthur Gleason

in *The Nation* of June 12th

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For Hoover

By ROBERT HERRICK

I AM an internationalist (and therefore a pacifist), a philosophical radical (or parlor Bolshevist, if you prefer the sneer), and something more than a skeptic as to the divine origin of the capitalistic system. Herbert Hoover is none of these things—and yet I believe he is the only one among the numerous presidential aspirants, either in or out of the limelight, to whom it will be safe to intrust the leadership of the nation at this time.

Hoover, fresh from the agonies of the war and the delusions of the peace, delivered himself (in his address in New York to the engineers) of a summary condemnation of what he called socialism, in which he included not only the Russian experiment in communism but everything except individualistic capitalism, on the ground that no other social system "produced." This was his immediate reaction to the confusions of Europe and the immense attendant misery, which he had observed at close range. It was the natural reaction of his Americanism (for in spite of the silly political insinuation of his being British, Hoover is, spiritually at least, the most purely American of all the candidates). He has never wavered since, so far as I know, in denouncing "the European patent medicine," and in criticizing even milder forms of social reintegration. His views on these basic matters are more important than any "ship or shoot" chatter, because they are obviously the convictions of knowledge and experience—the expression of a thought-out philosophy of life, rather than a mechanical reaction to popular or class prejudices, as with some of his conservative rivals. All his life this American engineer has dealt with men, singly and in masses, and his observation of "the human animal"—a subtly indicative favorite phrase—has led him to distrust the abstractions and higher idealisms of the radically minded. Self-interest seems to him the most reliable motive to get "the human animal" to function—otherwise to produce.

And yet I am for Hoover. As the days go by and we approach the drawing of the grand lottery, I marvel more and more at men of my kind for their suspicion of Hoover, for their following a fake radical like Johnson or an out and out radical like Debs or some little radical like Walsh and others. And I marvel even more at the larger number of Americans of his own breed, capitalists big and little and parasites of capitalism big and little, who are too blind to see in the election of Hoover to the presidency their best guaranty of their privilege, their comfort, and their endurance. . . .

I am not for Hoover because he fed the Belgians, splendid though that performance was, not (still more splendid) because he fed the starving women and children of Germany and Austria in the face of English indifference and French antagonism—the combined cynical wolfishness of the old order enthroned at Paris—no, not for these sentimental reasons, though they deservedly won for Mr. Hoover the prestige of being in the world's esteem the leading American citizen.

Nor would I vote for Hoover for president because he told American women how to save food, when to eat pork and when to refrain, though as an achievement in popular psychology and democratic statesmanship the food control of this lax, undisciplined nation of an hundred and ten millions of very hearty eaters was the work of genius. But a Lowden, or a Cox, or even a Harding, might make an efficient administrator and organizer of world relief on a large scale, and General Wood, we are not allowed to forget, organized Cuba so that it lasted for a few years and built roads there, *à la* Cæsar, that are the admiration of the thirsty American tourist. . . . No, not for these things should we make a man President of the United States today.

I am for Hoover first and most importantly, paradoxical as it may seem, because he is an individualist and capitalist—the only apparently sincere and convinced one of that faith in all the growing crowd of aspirants. He is not ashamed of capitalism: he really believes that it is the social system best fitted for "the human animal" (big and little) in his present state of political development—to be administered fairly and wisely ameliorated, and not smashed. As the bellicose English Churchill put it—"Capitalism has a good case." But how few of those who profess it and live by it really believe in it or act as if they did? They wave the sword like Wood; they see red like Palmer. They have no faith in the righteousness and inevitableness of their order. They are furtive and sullen and suspicious; they act like men with a bad case, illegally and secretly. Not Hoover! He believes robustly, and is not ashamed of his faith. He trusts capitalism as he trusts human nature. Compare his attitude toward labor with Gary's.

He believes in the system and he understands it—which is an even more important thing than belief. It is the sheer intelligence of the man Hoover that has won my allegiance. The others babble platitudes; like members of an outworn priestly caste they seem to think that by merely mumbling catchwords they can exorcise the proletarian devil. Hoover understands the infinitely intricate machine that modern capitalistic society has become. He knows just what will happen if you pull this lever instead of that one—or if you inadvertently should drop a wrench into its delicately interlacing gears. You never get a vague or evasive or rhetorical answer from Hoover, whether you prod him about sugar or inflation or compulsory arbitration. Instead of a rumble betraying emptiness or confusion of mind—and the political fear of saying something definite—you get from Hoover the cool ordered conclusions of the expert.

Whether one's sympathies are radical or reactionary, what we must have as a leader today is some one who knows. And the only man in the United States who thoroughly understands this moloch of a machine to which we are all inextricably hitched is Hoover. The machine is running badly—that needs no argument. Shall we smash it or patch it or try to forget its fearful groanings and act as if all were serene? I for one, who have no great faith in the machine or its perpetuity in its present form, would put the expert in charge and let him do his best for it. I do not like to set to sea—in this turbulent weather—in a Leviathan with a ferry boat captain on the bridge, trusting to chance and his good intentions. Nor with a captain who does not believe in steamships, but in dirigibles and planes! Hoover is our best expert, providentially trained in world affairs, and he is honest beyond the shadow of a doubt.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If human society is in a process of liquidation, if the World War was but the first terrific movement of forces that before they come to equilibrium will remake the spiritual geography of humanity, neither Hoover nor any "conservative" (not even the Attorney General waving an injunction) can stop these forces from grinding forwards to their appointed end. But in the convulsions through which we must pass human intelligence can do much to prevent needless antagonisms, avoidable wastes, fearful human misery—the reckless devastations of revolution. Hoover, courageous, humane, and understanding, is our best intelligence. Let us liquidate the old order under the leadership of one who both understands and has faith in it. And who is neither partisan nor mean minded. . . .

They say that Hoover cannot express himself. Remembering his "Americans do not fight women and children" and his "I believe in children," I think he can make himself understood, and a little less "style" in the White House would not be felt as a loss by many Americans. His is the labored style of the acting personality, who has all his life projected his thoughts into deeds, without the necessity of exploiting them, but it is a style that Americans understand. . . .

The coolness of the ardently liberal mind to Hoover is intelligible: he bluntly rejects the unproved hypotheses of radicalism and cruelly wounds its spiritual aspirations. But what is far less intelligible is why the comfort-loving classes dally with a Wood or a Lowden; why they cannot comprehend that Herbert Hoover has been sent to them miraculously as a life-preserver—why Wall Street with all its satellites is not marching *en masse* upon Washington to terrify those few foul old men, who pull the political wires to which we all must dance, into putting Hoover into the Presidency. The phenomenon, however, is not new. It was the same with Roosevelt, than whom a sounder conservative never held power. The shrinking capitalist, the timid investor, were afraid of Roosevelt, almost until the end. (They may not remember it now that they have made a hero of him, and are even turning to his adopted sons!) The politicians did not think Roosevelt "safe," nor always "sane." They could not perceive that essentially Roosevelt was not only one of them, but being honest in his fashion and shrewd he was their man to clean the social machine of some of its grosser stains and set it merrily running for the continued benefit of themselves, their sons and daughters, maintaining intact that order of society to which God had agreeably called them.

That curious blindness persists. Hoover is now the man of destiny to stand between a corrupt and ignorant and timid upper class and a world seething with revolts, discontents, and hatreds like ours. Why can they not recognize their redeemer? Because he is too honest, too intelligent for them. He would demand too many stern things of men of the Gary mind. His regimen would be too drastic, they feel, and they shrink from it. Some easier, more complacent practitioner will do the cure for them—a Dr. Wood or a Dr. Knox (the more orthodox the better). They will not call in this Hoover man until the crisis, when it will be too late for him or any other to save them.

Thus it has always been—which leads to the abiding conviction that no state of society succumbs from outside attack: it crumbles from within, from lack of faith in itself, from lack of conviction, from timidities and cowardices and softnesses. . . .

But Hoover, they tell us, can't be nominated. Those few blind old politicians, the mere cynical handful who in hotel parlors and clubrooms and party committees are even now "doping out" our destiny, hear no compelling voice from the nation to turn to Hoover. They will risk "putting it over" once more in the familiar fashion. They are looking for a "safe" candidate, the nearest possible to a phonographic nonentity, like a Coolidge or a Sproul. The Democrats emboldened by the impudence of the Republicans at Chicago will try to go them one better, in the opposite direction. For a Wood they have a Palmer; for a Lowden, a McAdoo. And the people of the United States? The irony of ironies, thanks to the perfect working of the two-party machine system—the Bunk and Boodle System—will happen unless—

Unless the millions of Americans who have faith in the present social order if decently administered, and the millions of Americans who dream of a better, juster order about to come from the throes of world suffering, give over their doubts and their dreams, and clamor—thunder for Hoover, until their cry penetrates even into the little rooms where those old men are "doping out" our destiny, with a Knox or a Harding as the leading card. Greater miracles have happened! They say that Hoover cannot be nominated, but nobody has dared to say that he cannot be elected—if his nomination is compelled. For he has fallen heir to all the vaunted American idealism left after the Peace Conference.

Back to Liberty

By JOSEPH IRWIN FRANCE

THE Republican Party must stand for the restoration of the Republic and for the complete restitution of civil liberty. The platform upon this and upon every issue must give an honest, explicit, positive promise. Every plank must be frank. This is no time for shifty, cowardly compromise. There must be repentance and full confession without attempt at self-justification. Every cloak and mask of hypocrisy put on in June will be stripped off before November. If the old parties dare not, there must arise a new party which will defend America's best ideals. Sickened by insincere and sugared verbiage, the people call for the unpalatable remedy of bitter fact. They demand an absolutely intrepid leadership which has faith in the people, a conscience and conviction, one armed with determination to make a valiant fight in defense of those great principles of constitutional liberty, dearer to American hearts than any and every cause or issue which might seem to be advanced by their violation.

In recent months I have differed with some of my Senate colleagues, not on the seriousness of the world malady, but on its cause and cure. I believe in the fundamental principles of democracy. Unrest cannot be cured by repression. Cooperation for production cannot be secured by coercion. Intolerant and despotic measures produce and aggravate the very condition which they are designed to cure. It is for this reason that I have contended for the preservation of representative government in the United States without abridgment of the rights of our citizens; for the free and unfettered discussion of all public questions; and for amnesty to persons imprisoned for the expression of their opinions.

I have opposed the use of the injunction in labor disputes,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not because I desire to see strikes and industrial unrest, but because to compel men to work by the power of government is to establish a new form of slavery and to create still greater unrest. The stability of our institutions, of our financial and industrial structure depends upon securing a restoration of cooperation between labor and capital for production, which can never be secured by repressive methods on the one hand or violence on the other. As long as labor is considered a mere commodity, the employer will buy as much as possible and the employees sell as little as possible for a given wage. The American genius which has applied democracy to government can surely find a practical means of applying democracy to industry, without on the one hand unsettling our business structure or on the other destroying the freedom and dignity of labor. During the war we attained cooperation between labor and capital for the maximum production necessary to carry on that great enterprise. We should be able to attain this same result for the still greater ends of peace.

There must be nationwide cooperation to reduce the high cost of living by stimulating productive effort, particularly in agriculture. Cooperation between capital and labor is also necessary for the highly patriotic service of larger production. By personal economy, by eliminating extravagance and waste, by better organized distribution, by increased taxation of unused land, by developing our natural resources, and by rigid governmental economy for the cure of currency inflation, and finally by a speedy reduction in the public debt, we can bring prices again within a normal limit.

I myself opposed the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment because when it was submitted, full and free discussion by the people themselves had been curtailed by an intimidating federal statute and millions of our citizens were practically removed from political activity by absence from home in the service of their country. Moreover, I believe that any amendment providing for national prohibition should have conferred upon Congress the power to legislate instead of placing a prohibitory statute in the Constitution as a part of our basic law. I believe that the Constitution should preserve, and that any amendment thereto should enlarge and not curtail, the liberty and sovereign power of the people to decide all questions relating to public policy and the general welfare. If, however, the Eighteenth Amendment shall be sustained by the Supreme Court, I believe that a great principle is involved in the question of its proper interpretation and enforcement. It is important that men should be temperate, but it is more important that they should be free. I do not believe that one class or section of the country should impose its arbitrary will upon another, especially in a matter where men differ so greatly as they do in regard to light wines and beer. The abolition of the saloon has marked a real advance in our national life, but it is highly dangerous to bring about even such a desirable reform by writing a prohibitory statute into the Constitution. I believe that the prohibition of light wines and beer goes unnecessarily far in the destruction of personal liberty and self-determination. How far dare we go without endangering liberty, in legislating our own opinions on others, against their will, on a subject of good manners or good morals? I am deeply interested in this question of the preservation of freedom and of self-determination, and it is a cause for deep concern that large masses of our people should be given what they consider a justifiable grievance against the Government and its laws. I believe that a reconsideration of this whole subject and the granting to the people themselves the right to determine whether light wine and beer shall be distributed would, whatever the outcome, go far toward allaying national unrest. The parties should take frank and courageous stands upon all these great questions, and on them all candidates should voice fully and fearlessly their opinion.

I have favored and contended for measures to ameliorate many unsatisfactory social conditions; for a comprehensive and rational census, which would be a scientific, social, and industrial survey of our country with constantly up-to-date records; for the removal of widespread illiteracy, and of preventable injuries and diseases by better public education and health agencies; for the abolition of child labor; for elimination of unsanitary living conditions of the workers; for federal employment bureaus and community public buildings. I have advocated the curbing of executive power, the reorganization of the executive departments of our Government, a mercantile marine in keeping with the size and importance of our commerce, and an enlarged navy. I have advocated a revision of the federal system of taxation, woman suffrage, a decrease in the inflation of currency and bank credits, and measures which would encourage cooperative buying and selling, as well as eliminate unnecessary costs now attendant upon our system of distribution; and I have advocated the encouragement and stimulation of industry by the repeal of vicious legislation and the passage of measures in harmony with sound business principles.

The liberal spirit of the world demanded a league of nations, and though in harmony with this great spirit of liberty, I was forced to become a bitter-ender in opposition to the league as proposed by the five venerable statesmen of a passing age who gathered around the peace table at Versailles. Their spirit lagged behind the new spirit of liberty which is surging throughout the world. Instead of creating a concert of all nations for the purpose of ending war, establishing international cooperation and friendship of peoples, they in fact established an imperialistic alliance designed to preserve the old international order and to guarantee to the victors the spoils of conquest. To this enterprise the wealth and power of America were to be pledged. If even this league had contained in its membership all of the nations of the world and had been easily amendable in its constitution, we might have accepted it in the hope that it could be changed into an instrument for liberty and progress. But great nations are left out and no new member can be admitted without the unanimous consent of all; no change can be made unless each Power represented in the league shall consent. To such a fraudulent scheme, conceived in secret and born of the spirit of old European imperialism, the liberty-loving, forward-looking people of America could not consent.

I had hoped that there would stand forth in my own party some fearless leader who would declare his devotion to the fundamental American principles of liberty and of liberalism. If such a leader can be found, if such a standard-bearer will unfurl his colors, I will be the first to follow his leadership, but if none shall stand fearless and forthright upon these issues, I shall still contend for them from whatever point of political vantage I may have or gain, nor shall I yield a foot of ground to those who would assail them. One thing I will say, and in saying it I speak not only for myself but I believe for my party and for the American people, when I say that in this critical hour we will not tolerate a candidate who will equivocate.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dark Horses and White Hopes

IRVINE LUTHER LENROOT first became a national figure in the Wisconsin senatorial contest of 1918. When its junior senator, Paul Husting, died, some, mindful of La Follette's stand against the war, feared to test the State, and advised an ad interim appointment. An election, however, was decided upon, and the problem was to shape the issue. It was necessary to unite the loyalist supporters of La Follette with his old line, stalwart, opponents, and this was no easy task. The one man who was regarded as capable of performing it, was the member from the eleventh district, who stood for La Follette's general program, but was loyally supporting the war. To ask him, however, was to ask a sacrifice, for it was generally understood he could command the Speakership whenever the Republicans should win the House of Representatives, and no one needs to be told that a strong hold on the Speakership is better in politics than the chances of a doubtful senatorial contest.

Lenroot did not hesitate, but resigned from Congress and threw himself into a fiercely fought campaign, in which he won the Republican nomination, defeating the La Follette candidate, Thompson. He was not yet in the Senate, however, nor was the issue of loyalty entirely decided. The Democrats put forward Joseph Davies, who resigned the chairmanship of the Federal Trade Commission, and who received the full support of the national administration. Vice-President Marshall in a speech at Madison foreshadowed President Wilson's famous campaign letter of the autumn by identifying support for the war with support for the Democratic party. But Lenroot was again victorious, and entered the Senate pledged to support the war, but not pledged to support the Administration.

Lenroot's previous career had not been dramatic but had been consistent, characteristically American, and successful. Born in Superior, in 1869, of Swedish parents, he had ambition, a vigorous physique, and frontier opportunities. After a common school education, he used his strength in the lumber camps to earn money to study stenography. With that as a weapon he studied law, first in a law office and then as court reporter. At twenty-eight he was admitted to the bar. At thirty-two he was elected to the Wisconsin legislature, as one of the group of young men moved by the magnetism and the arguments of Robert M. La Follette, who was at the same time elected governor. One term was sufficient to show his mettle, and when the Progressives obtained a majority in the following legislature, Lenroot was selected as Speaker, and it was under his leadership that most of what is known as the La Follette legislative program was put upon the statute books. After an interval he became, in 1909, a member of the national House of Representatives.

In the Senate his words on all subjects were well received, and in the last session's discussions of the Peace Treaty, again, as in the House, he emerged as leader; for that is the position he practically occupied with reference to the "mild reservationists." Here also his legal skill was called upon, and about half the reservations seriously considered were of his drafting.

In determining what he stands for Lenroot's background cannot be overlooked. Superior, when he was born, combined many characteristically American conditions. Surrounded by forests primeval, its neighborhood rang to the ax of the lumberjacks and its dreary, muddy streets to their seasonal carouses. It was, however, no mere lumber town, for none of the multitude of American centers which have aspired to become continental centers of commerce and wealth have had more persistent, and in some respects more reasonable, dreams of future greatness. The ambition of Superior was based on its location, at the inmost point of inland navigation. It was transportation which was to make its fortunes, and the problems of rail and water, of the long and short hauls, breaks in transit, canals, and above all rates, were and are the daily topic of conversation. The m mber for Superior must of necessity be an expert in all these problems, and Lenroot has studied them.

While Lenroot was a young man, the solid agricultural development of the region began. This was no easy process; the fight to win a farm was long and difficult, but worth while. The men and women who were to succeed in it must be strong and full of purpose and persistence. It is this population mainly that he has represented, and whose interests are of greatest concern to him. Of late years, however, large industry has come into existence. The transportation that really first gave prosperity was that from the nearby iron ranges, but now much of the iron is manufactured at Superior itself, and so his district has become more complex. As interpreted by local interests, his appeal to the manfacturing element is through the tariff. He stands well with labor, but he has no leanings toward socialism. His attitude is fundamentally determined by his constituency of hard-working farmers. While the frontier farmer often asks the government to do things that seem to tame city-dwellers socialistic, it is not because of any sympathy with socialist ideals, but rather just because his conviction is so strong that no government can ever impair his rooted individualism.

Senator Lenroot is primarily a parliamentarian. His manner is dignified and easy, and his speech clear cut and cultured. He has a clean, legal mind and sound legal information. He is good natured and tactful, and has the ability of harmonizing divergent forces. He is a progressive with the conservative manner. He does not regard his opponents as enemies, nor do they become enemies. His conceptions have widely expanded during his public career, and he talks with men to learn as well as to convince. As a public speaker he is sound, unassuming, and effective, but he seldom thrills. The impression he leaves is good, and frequently results in votes. It is those with whom he is most closely connected, however, that have the highest regard for him. President Roosevelt counted on him largely, and advised his friends to "watch Lenroot."

Lenroot is being daily more seriously considered as a dark horse, and may possibly run away with the nomination in a Republican Convention deadlocked between the active candidates. In fact, he is probably the only really genuine dark horse we have. All the others have campaigned more or less subtly, and in every other dark horse camp there is a feeling of pleasant and hopeful anticipation. Lenroot, whose political interest is in his coming contest for reelection to the Senate with his old antagonist, Thompson, has not raised a finger. He will not even, on the earlier ballots, get a single vote from his own state, nearly all the delegates of which are pledged to La Follette. That is what makes the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

possibility of Lenroot the more interesting and not the less likely.

"AWAITING the peoples' call"—is one picture we have of the Governor of Pennsylvania, William Cameron Sproul. So many are awaiting that call. Judging from those still expectant, it looks as if the country really wanted nobody for president—and might get him. For his great value—unlike the Keystone State's other favorite son, Knox—is that to the country at large Sproul is nobody.

That is only true in regard to widespread, national publicity. Speaking in his own State, before almost any audience, Governor Sproul is apt to reminisce entertainingly about his friend and Swarthmore classmate, Attorney General Palmer. Party politics have separated them now, but the erstwhile association is highly valued by the Quaker in the governor's seat. Now you come to think of it, the two are much alike, even in physique. Both are "fighters." (Forget the anomaly.) If the Governor breaks into national politics he may even become plain Cameron Sproul.

The kinship with Mitchell Palmer extends even further. The first bill presented to the Pennsylvania legislature by the Governor was a sedition act, providing that anything "which tends" to incite sedition is punishable with heavy fines and twenty years in jail. The measure was defeated by a few votes. Sproul then forced its reconsideration and passage by a narrow margin. All the evidence indicates that his friends would like to have this remarkable law forgotten. It has been totally ignored and never enforced, despite the glorious opportunity afforded by the steel strike.

The Governor, however, deserves credit for many constructive measures—though, despite promises, none of these trod on the toes of the various wealthy groups with which he is closely associated. For the Governor himself heads various great projects—an iron and steel company, a shipbuilding concern, and not least, a newspaper, the Chester *Times-Republican*, which, curiously enough, was the first daily in the country to discover, in an eight-column headline, that the "Country wants Sproul."

In viewing Governor Sproul as a presidential possibility during that brief quadrennial period when "a square deal for labor" becomes the avowed high purpose of every aspirant, it is interesting to note that so conservative a body as the American Federation of Labor resolved in its state convention to call for his impeachement for his "gross failure to consider and relieve the many complaints and abuses of power on the part of the state constabulary during the steel strike." The vote was unanimous.

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER is a university president; so was Woodrow Wilson. To some millions of Americans these facts are enough. They want no more university presidents in the White House for at least a breathing spell and they will not vote for another of them. As a matter of fact, nothing in Dr. Butler's career as an educator ought to make any of the "practical" afraid that he might turn out "theoretical." No danger is more remote. Before the war, indeed, he had a kind of idealism in his attachment to the cause of peace and international conciliation, but it was not a handicapping idealism. As soon as the war came he dropped it, declared that peace is not an ideal end at all but the reward of struggle, and turned his back on those of his former associates in the cause who inconveniently tried to act as if they believed the things they had been saying. Dr. Butler's illusions, too, have not been unfortunate ones. They have centered pretty closely around the notion that might makes things very likely right—as in the days when the German Kaiser seemed to Dr. Butler one of the great rulers of the earth—and that the status quo is generally founded on a rock which he, for one, would be the last man to trifle with. No one should be deceived by the elaborate and eclectic program which Dr. Butler has put forth. He means what he says when he talks about the necessity of a budget and of an efficient and responsible administration, but he means, if we may judge by his past deeds, nothing liberal. His economic principles are the crux. They may be summed up in his famous discovery that men work for society in three ways—some with their hands, some with their heads, some with their accumulations. From almost anyone but a Senator or a university president this would sound like a parody, but from Dr. Butler it is dead earnest. As a man who works with his head, he probably thinks of himself as occupying the middle ground between the two extremes, but his sympathies have always leaned, now lean, and will always lean toward the side of the accumulations.

GOVERNOR CALVIN COOLIDGE of Massachusetts some months ago announced that he was not a candidate for the Presidency, and would take no part in the preconvention struggle for delegates. This non-participation in the contest, it now appears, has already cost $68,000, and it is known that the promotion of the Governor's ambitions was some time ago intrusted to a prominent national advertising agency. Governor Coolidge's decision not to enter overtly the preconvention race was entirely shrewd, as his record was too vulnerable to stand scrutiny; for Coolidge's national reputation is based on a myth with which he may fool all of Massachusetts a long time, but not all of America even a considerable length of time. He was touted over the country as the man who restored law and order at the time of the Boston police strike, but as *The Nation* showed in an article on December 20, last, Governor Coolidge raised never a finger to prevent this unfortunate event. He sat on the fence until the mischief had been done and Mayor Peters had restored order. Then he climbed down on the safe side—where the crowd was. The words of the citizens' committee that reported on the police strike ought to constitute his political epitaph: "By Thursday morning order had been generally restored in the city. On Thursday afternoon the Governor assumed control of the situation."

NO two Republican candidates are more frequently mentioned in one breath than Lowden and Harding. They are the party's Gold Dust Twins. Of them the Old Guard would gladly say to the voters, "Let them do your work." Both are honorable men and either would be agreeable. But they represent the passing generation in American politics—the period of "stuffed shirt" oratory, of sonorous glorification of "the party that gave to the country the immortal name of Abraham Lincoln," of platitudes, of privilege. Fundamentally there is little difference between them. Lowden has been an effective Governor of Illinois, is the more magnetic, and probably the abler of the two, but his recently revealed half million dollar slush fund will not help him. As for Harding, he was Winthrop Murray Crane's first choice in 1916, and while "Uncle Murray" still pretty nearly runs the Republican Party, his indorsement, curiously enough, is a wellnigh fatal handicap. Another disqualification is that Harding was the "keynoter" at the last convention. Many of the 1916 delegates will sit again at Chicago, and those who heard him then will not vote for him now.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARTHUR GOULD BALDWIN MEMORIAL LIBRARY

Henry Allen's Industrial Court

By FRANK P. WALSH

WHEN this is read, the special train which left the Kansas capital a day or two ago, loaded with statesmen, near statesmen, and short-grass politicians, with Governor Henry J. Allen at their head, will have come and gone, the joint debate between Samuel Gompers and the Governor of Kansas at Carnegie Hall will be history, and another dark horse, groomed and ready, will be in the Republican paddock, awaiting the drop of the starter's flag.

The one big campaign card of Governor Allen as a candidate for the Presidency is the passage of his Kansas Industrial Court Bill last January. The Governor assures us that his bill is a guaranteed cure for all industrial ills. Chambers of commerce and "big business" generally stamp it with their enthusiastic approval. Workers everywhere denounce it as a ruthless violation of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which provides that "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

The bill has thirty sections. Governor Allen proudly boasts that "it has teeth"; so we may clear the underbrush of legal technique, words soft and weasly, and examine its "teeth." After providing for the appointment of three judges, compensation of officials, machinery of investigation, methods of procedure, and the reaffirmation of a few ancient and inalienable rights guaranteed not to interfere with the main object of the bill, the following appears:

> Sec. 8. The Court of Industrial Relations shall order such changes, if any, as are necessary to be made in and about the conduct of said industry, employment, utility or common carrier, in the matters of working and living conditions, hours of labor, rules and practices, and a reasonable minimum wage, or standard of wages. . . .
>
> Sec. 18. Any person wilfully violating the provisions of this act, or any valid order of said Court of Industrial Relations, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof in any court of competent jurisdiction of this State shall be punished by a fine of not to exceed $1,000, or by imprisonment in the county jail for a period of not to exceed one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.
>
> Sec. 19. Any officer of any corporation engaged in any of the industries, employments, utilities, or common carriers herein named and specified, or any officer of any labor union or association of persons engaged as workers in any such industry, employment, utility, or common carrier, or any employer of labor, coming within the provisions of this act, who shall wilfully use the power, authority, or influence incident to his official position, or to his position as an employer of others, and by such means shall intentionally influence, impel, or compel any other person to violate any of the provisions of this act, or any valid order of said Court of Industrial Relations, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof in any court of competent jurisdiction shall be punished by a fine not to exceed $5,000, or by imprisonment in the State penitentiary at hard labor for a term not to exceed two years, or by both fine and imprisonment.

Perhaps the best legal definition of "involuntary servitude" is "any control by which the personal services of a human being is disposed of or coerced for another's benefit." If, therefore, the Court of Industrial Relations should make an order establishing "working and living conditions," hours of labor, rules and practices, and a reasonable minimum wage, which were obnoxious to a group of workers, or shocked their sense of right, or which they believed inadequate to sustain life, the person or persons "who violated the order" could be sent to jail for a year and fined $1,000; and "any officer" of any labor union or association of persons engaged as workers in any such industry who used his "power, authority, or influence" to "*influence*, impel, or compel any other person to violate any such order" of the Court of Industrial Relations could be sent to the penitentiary for two years and fined $5,000.

As this law stands forth in its nakedness, the query must arise, "why should a State that had its genesis in opposition to black slavery pass such a law, and by what process of reasoning can a modern day politician hope to gain high office by its advocacy?" A little historical and political background may shed this light. Kansas is essentially a great agricultural State. The law was passed at a special session of the legislature, called by Governor Allen, the overwhelming majority of the members of the legislature, of course, representing rural districts, and composed of farmers, small merchants, with a scattering of professional men and local attorneys for railroads. The coal strike had just ended. It had caused much hardship upon the farms and in the towns and villages of the State. The report of the President's Commission, showing that for at least two years the miners generally had been working for a wage 30 per cent below the line of bare subsistence, had not yet been given to the public. Before the legislature met the law had been prepared down to its smallest essential detail by Governor Allen and his political advisers.

The legislature was Republican in both branches, with the Allen faction of Kansas politicians overwhelmingly dominant. Smarting under the fresh sufferings caused by the coal strike, the sentiment of the legislature smacked strongly of the spirit of a "lynching bee." The proposed bill was replete with admonitions to the "Court" to be "reasonable" in its regulations. It has many "drastic" provisions leveled against employers for non-compliance, designed as a soft and alluring covering for the "teeth." But that it is an attempt to coerce human beings to give their services for the benefit of others against their free will and choice, cannot be denied or glossed over.

There are but two important industrial centers in the State, the great packing houses on the eastern border of Kansas—second only in extent to Chicago—and the coal fields, comprising a few counties surrounding Pittsburg. The meat packers, known as the "Big Five," have not only maintained a powerful lobby in the State for a generation, but have until recently effectually stamped out every effort of the workers to organize. The organization in that industry is new and struggling, and has not, as yet, come into violent conflict with its employers. The coal industry, compared with other States, is not large. The vein is not deep and is confined to a small area. It is all bituminous, and not of superior quality. The miners are compactly organized. Alexander Howat is the district president. The mines are owned by a few individuals and corporations, the dominating one being the Central Coal and Coke Company, which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has spread out into the coal and lumber business in adjoining States, and is wealthy and powerful.

The story of the miners' efforts to establish and maintain their organization is a painful and bloody one. Starvation, military repression, stockades, and prison pens mark its course. Tragedy after tragedy blot its pages. The Kansas *City Star* runs a column headed "In Kansas City Forty Years Ago." On the second day of this month there appeared the following:

May 2, 1880.

The long strike in the coal mines operated by Bovard & Co. and Keith & Henry at Cherokee, Kas., has been ended. All the former employees are out, and colored men have taken their places in the mines.

But the miners' fight was not ended. The United Mine Workers of America entered the struggle. Leader after leader appeared, only to be destroyed or absorbed by the big mining group. The mine owners of Kansas are banded together with those of adjacent States as the Southwestern Interstate Coal Operators' Association. The Keith & Henry firm of forty years ago has grown into the all-powerful Central Coal and Coke Company. Its founder has passed away, but the leadership of the vast business which he built is controlled by his son, Charles S. Keith.

But also in due time came Alexander Howat. Howat is a Scotch coal digger who began life as a breaker boy in the coal mines of Scotland. Powerful in physique, with a strong mind and will of adamant, a deep student of economic and social questions, he has a burning sympathy for the dispossessed. In an incredibly short space of time he had risen to the head of the Miners' District Union. He is an honest man. His heart never stirred with the emotion of fear. He has all the canniness typical of his race. Under his leadership the miners' organization quickly reached an unbreakable one hundred per cent. He represents the 12,000 miners in the district in the making of contracts with the Southwestern Operators' Association. He is the arbiter of the workers in the settlement of their grievances. Here is one man who cannot be awed or purchased. Governor Allen in his public speeches has stated that one object of the law is to drive Alexander Howat from power. The miners believe it to be the sole object of the law. They declare that Governor Allen, with all the power of the State, has taken up the fight of the Coal Operators' Association; that if he succeeds they must fall back to the wretched conditions of old.

More history. In 1914 Joseph H. Hazen, manager of a coal company in Crawford County, Kansas, testified in a suit at Kansas City that he had bribed Alexander Howat by the payment of $20,000 in currency to favor a clause in a contract with the Operators' Association which was inimical to the interests of the working miners. He testified that he received the bribe money from the hands of the president of the Southwestern Operators' Association for the specific purpose. He repeated the statement off the witness stand, and Howat sued him for slander. In a trial before Hon. T. J. Seehorn, Judge of the Circuit Court at Kansas City, Missouri, Howat received a verdict of $7,000 damages and a complete vindication at the hands of a jury. There was not a single union man on the jury. It was composed exclusively of business men and representatives of local corporations. The President of the Southwestern Operators' Association, Charles S. Keith, upon the witness stand in Howat's slander suit, admitted that he drew the $20,000 from the funds of the association, with the approval of others on the executive committee, and gave it to Hazen, the manager, for the purpose of bribing Howat and another district president. But every cent of the money, by the bank records, was traced back into the bank accounts of the manager who received it in the first instance, and not a penny of it went to Howat or his associate. The man who told the lie about Howat fled the jurisdiction of the court. He was not present at the trial. But Charles S. Keith, the president of the Southwestern Operators' Association, not only admitted that he gave the $20,000 to the mine manager, but with shame-flushed face was compelled to admit on cross-examination that the day before Hazen, the manager, testified to the falsehood against Howat in the civil suit, he had met him in the Grand Hotel, in Kansas City, Kansas, and there gave him $10,000 in currency, the money of the Operators' Association, to induce him to cross the State line of Kansas into Missouri for the purpose of testifying. All of this is from the court record.

At the last election of the miners, about a month ago, Howat was reelected president. The vote was by a referendum ballot. Howat was elected with a negative vote of but twenty-one in the twelve thousand ballots cast by the miners. Governor Allen in his speeches denounces him as a "labor czar" who does not represent the rank and file of the workers. So did the Southwestern Coal Operators' Association and its satellites. They are the sponsors of the Kansas Court of Industrial Relations. They are the chief Kansas influence behind the Allen candidacy for President.

The signature of the Governor was scarcely dry upon the bill when the court proceeded to the mining district to investigate a local strike. Howat refused to recognize the court. He denounced it as an attempt to enslave the free miners of Kansas in violation of the Constitution of his State and nation. He was sent to jail for contempt of court. The moment the key was turned in the lock, 12,000 miners, without any order, or agreement for concert of action, walked out of the mines. The coal industry was totally paralyzed. Howat made a speech from the balcony of the jail, declaring that the miners would never submit to the jurisdiction or obey any order of the Allen Court. Later he appealed his case to the Supreme Court of Kansas, and was released on bond. The moment he left his cell 12,000 miners shouldered their picks and shovels and went back to their work. Order after order by the Court of Industrial Relations was defied or ignored by the miners.

Howat challenged the law in open court. He declared publicly that he defied its orders and would continue to do so. He challenged Governor Allen and his Attorney General to send him to the penitentiary if the law was constitutional. But the Attorney General, instead of haling Howat into the new court, dodged into the District Court at Pittsburg and applied for a regular, old-fashioned injunction to restrain Howat and the miners from striking, conspiring to strike, with all the other allegations of the time-honored injunction sort. This although Kansas has a law which is the counterpart of the Federal law, which safeguards the right of workers to strike, if they see fit. A temporary injunction was granted. The case will be tried in a week or two.

Governor Allen and his advisers were afraid to accept Howat's challenge to test the law. How could an unconstitutional law be used for a Presidential platform? What earthly use would his friends, the coal operators, have for a "toothless" law? Judging the future by the past, if the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

injunction is decided against Howat and he goes to jail, then the 12,000 miners will drop their picks and shovels and again paralyze the entire coal industry of Kansas. Governor Allen declares that his court bill prevents strikes. The workers point out that it is the only law in Kansas history which ever caused a strike of 12,000 men in one industry, to say nothing of its failure to prevent many smaller ones.

The law has been roundly denounced by Governors of other States, candidates for the Presidency, economists, and impartial men and women who have studied its provisions. How then does a clever politician like Governor Allen hope to win the Republican nomination for the Presidency upon the prestige of its passage? Why should the coal operators, chambers of commerce and big business cheer him along in his race? Is it the fatuous hope that the Supreme Court of the United States will not declare the law unconstitutional? Or that the workers of Kansas will submit, and that labor will be securely harnessed and padlocked for all time? Not at all. Governor Allen knows that the law cannot be tested in the Supreme Court of the United States until long after the Presidential election. His powerful supporters know that he is a "safe" man. He has proved it. They believe the influential daily press of the country can be relied upon to do the rest, by misrepresentation or silent treatment. But the Kansas workers declare that even Governor Allen cannot succeed in crushing their organizations where the coal operators, the big packers, and the lumber trust have failed. And the whole trade union movement of the nation is enlisted for the fight against the law. It will be taken from the back-wash of State and national politics. The court test will be the legal right of all workers to control their own lives. Behind the politics and law of it may loom big the free workers' last resort—the economic power of the combined producers of Kansas; perhaps of America.

The Republicans and the Black Voter

By W. E. BURGHARDT DUBOIS

IF we take as our basis the election of 1916 and assume that women will vote, it would seem probable that the balance of power which will determine the way in which the electoral votes of eight pivotal States will be cast will depend roughly upon the following number of voters: Illinois, 100,000; Indiana, 10,000; Kentucky, 60,000; Maryland, 40,000; Michigan, 90,000; New Jersey, 120,000; New York, 220,000; Ohio, 180,000. The electoral votes of Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia may depend on an equally narrow marginal group, and the decision in these seventeen States will determine the election. Recently there has been a large migration of adult Negroes from the South. It seems probable, then, that in the next election the number of Negroes eligible to vote will be: Illinois, 125,000; Michigan, 25,000; Indiana, 45,000; Kentucky, 150,000; Maryland, 150,000; New Jersey, 75,000; New York, 125,000; Ohio, 100,000. If this estimate should prove true then in the first mentioned four States, the Negro voter easily holds the balance of power. In four others he might hold the balance in a fairly close election. Moreover, he holds large power and in many Congressional districts decisive power in the other nine States mentioned. He could then, if he voted intelligently and with an eye single to his greatest political advantage, decide the election of 1920.

He could not only decide who would be President but more important, he could greatly influence the complexion of Congress. The present Senate has forty-seven Democrats and forty-nine Republicans, so that without the indicted Senator from Michigan the Republicans lead by one. Nine senators are to be elected from Iowa, Kansas, Ohio, Kentucky, Illinois, Maryland, Missouri, Indiana, and New York. The Negro vote might easily decide which party should control the Senate. The House Republican majority is forty-one, and Negroes by voting carefully in the forty-one Districts might easily cut down if not destroy it.

The reader will immediately say: This is all very well and would call for careful attention if the Negro voter were intelligent, experienced and determined. But he has a large percentage of illiteracy; he has had no political experience; and hitherto he has voted with his heart and not his head. We may, therefore, be sure that the Republicans are not losing much sleep over the Negro vote. They are saying that Wilson has made it impossible for any Negro to vote Democratic, and therefore there is nothing else for him to do but vote Republican. This calculation may be sound, but there are other considerations. First, the Negroes as a mass have done more thinking in the last four years than ever before. Second, they have long-standing grievances against the Republican Party, and it cannot therefore count on the absolute necessity of a black man voting Republican.

Americans must not forget the deep distrust and resentment left among the Negro population by the later Taft and Roosevelt policies. When they turned over the patronage of the South to its whites they did not prevent Republicanism in the South from continuing to be mainly a matter of patronage, and thus they joined the South in disfranchising the best of the Negroes in the counsels of the party. It was then that a small group of Negroes conceived the idea that there might be a chance to interest farseeing Democrats. They believed Mr. Wilson to be a new type of politician. They thought that he must see that present political conditions in the South could not be permanent and they inquired if it might not be possible to make a tentative alliance between the forward-thinking northern Democrats and intelligent Negroes, with the idea of dividing the northern Negro vote and gradually bringing a real government of the people in the South. The first overtures toward this end brought instant response. In a letter to Alexander Walters, a colored bishop, written just before the election of 1912, Mr. Wilson expressed his "earnest wish to see justice done them [the colored people] in every matter; and not mere grudging justice, but justice executed with liberality and cordial good feeling."

This induced a considerable number of Negroes to vote the Democratic ticket in 1912 and those that were not persuaded by Wilson's words were helped by the extraordinary attitude of the Progressive party under Mr. Roosevelt, which despite its vast enthusiasm of song and tears absolutely refused even to consider a plank which said, "The Progressive party recognizes that distinctions of race or class in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

political life have no place in a democracy." Wilson's election followed, and the Republican split made it difficult to determine just what the Negro vote meant. Needless to say, in 1916 it went solidly for Hughes.

Coming now to 1920 we have first to note that these experiences have not improved the temper of the Negro voter. In the first place, intelligence, not only as measured by formal schooling but as measured by wider social experience, is spreading fast in the Negro race and was quickened by the Great War. Black men are determined as never before not simply to vote but to make their votes tell. Intelligent leaders do not yet represent or control the majority of Negro voters, but this type of leadership is more widely effective today than ever before.

The calculations of the Republicans may first go awry in assuming that Negroes will not vote for Democrats. So far as the national Democratic ticket is concerned, this is of course perfectly true. No black man could vote for the "Solid South" and no Democratic candidate dare repudiate the support of this rotten borough system. But the Democratic organizations in certain northern States, and particularly in northern cities, have been giving a great deal of solicitous attention to Negroes. In New York City, for instance, there is a strong and intelligent Negro Democratic organization. The Negroes can get more consideration from the Democratic Congressman in the one black Harlem district than from any of their Republican Congressmen. They have consequently been voting more and more independently in Harlem in local elections and have their own representatives on the Board of Aldermen, in the Legislature, and in various branches of the civil service. In other cities and States the Democrats have made similar inroads.

It is quite possible, then, for Democratic Congressmen, legislators, and governors to attract a considerable number of Negro votes and it is noticeable in this election that Negroes recognize that they are not nearly so much interested in the President of the United States as they are in their local aldermen and members of their State legislatures and particularly their Congressmen.

Again the radicals have begun to see light with regard to Negroes. They realize that they must do more than flourish and beckon to get Negro support. The Committee of Forty-Eight has demanded: "equal economic, political and legal rights for all, irrespective of sex or color." The Socialist Party has put this plank in its platform: "Congress should enforce the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment with reference to the Negroes, and effective Federal legislation should be enacted to secure to the Negroes full civil, political, industrial educational rights." The Labor Party has not been as explicit but it is making distinct overtures. Without doubt there will be a large Negro radical vote.

On the other hand, the Republicans are following placidly the old path. In the South they are encouraging the "Lily Whites" to "contest" the Negro delegates. Tennessee is typical. In that State a strong, intelligently led colored Republican movement has gained much headway, yet when their convention met, white men, both Republicans and Democrats, held a rival convention and will send rival delegates to the national convention. At the convention the Republican Party will be obsessed by the idea of building up a white Republican Party in the South. The "Lily Whites" will gain most of the "contests." The only appeal that the Republicans are now making to the colored vote is the old appeal of bald money bribery. The *Crisis* says:

> Every four years the disgrace of the buying up of certain delegates for the Republican convention is repeated in the Southern South. In South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, there are a few professional grafters, black and white, who assume to represent the "Republican Party." They are for sale to the highest bidder. Republican candidates begin their campaign by sending men into the South to buy the support of these men, and the whole Negro race is blamed for this recurring disgrace. But whose is the fault? The fault lies at the doors of the National Republican Party. Not only is the party and its candidates willing and eager to buy up this support, but they have repeatedly refused support or countenance to the better class of colored leaders who seek to oust these thieves.

What do Negroes expect to gain by political action? How far are they to be satisfied by platform dissertations on the Rights of Man? Do they expect to be legislated into complete modern freedom or have they thought out a clear straight political path leading to their ideals? Four years ago I could have answered these questions only by stating my own personal opinions. Today I can do more. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People sent to seventeen presidential candidates and near candidates the following questionnaire:

1. Will you favor the enactment of laws making lynching a federal offense?
2. What is your attitude toward the disfranchisement of Americans of Negro descent: (a) will you advocate that Congress enforce the 14th Amendment and reduce the representation of States which disfranchise their citizens, or (b) will you advocate the appointment of United States Commissioners to enforce the 15th Amendment?
3. Will you endeavor to bring about the abolition of "Jim Crow" cars in interstate traffic?
4. Will you withdraw armed or other interference with the independence of Haiti?
5. Will you urge national aid to elementary education, without discrimination against Negro children?
6. Will you pledge the apportionment of Negro soldiers and Negro officers in the armed forces of the United States in proportion to their numbers in population?
7. Will you abolish racial segregation in the Civil Service of the United States?

Fifteen of those questioned preserved a discreet silence. Two replied but avoided committing themselves. Very well. The same or a similar questionnaire will go to every candidate for Congress. Some of these will refuse to answer while others like Dyer of Missouri and Madden of Illinois will hasten to answer favorably and in detail because a majority of their constituents are black and because, within the next four years, these men will be succeeded in Congress by black men. Other Negro Congressmen loom in the far horizon in New York and Pennsylvania. The dilly-dallying of the Republicans has already beaten the Harlem districts of New York into the most independent voting district in the city. Party labels mean nothing there: A hundred thousand Negroes simply ask the candidates: Where do you stand on OUR problem?

This is symptomatic. The Republicans may ignore the Negro or pat him graciously on the back as in the past. The Democrats may continue to depend on oligarchy and mob rule in the South. Neither attitude will disturb the new Negro voter, for he expects it. He is simply going to seek to keep the Negro hater and the straddler out of Congress and the legislatures, and wherever possibly he will support the candidate that stands for his Seven Points.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Michaels Stern & Co. vs. The Amalgamated

By ANNE HAMILTON COOLIDGE

THE suit of Michaels Stern & Co. against the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, now being tried in Rochester, centers around the moot labor issues of the injunction and of picketing.

A strike against this firm broke out on Saturday, the 26th of last July. Within three days, 657 workers had quit. The local Joint Board of the Amalgamated, which called the strike, immediately wired the national office in New York and by Monday Sidney Hillman, president of the union, was in Rochester. Mr. Stern had earlier refused to see a committee headed by the local manager of the Amalgamated. But he conferred with Mr. Hillman for more than two hours on Tuesday afternoon in the office of Judge Sutherland, attorney for the firm. The way for adjustment was left open. This was a period of acute labor shortage, but Mr. Hillman volunteered not to place the strikers for several days, giving the firm a chance to decide upon dealing with the union. On Friday a terse conversation over the telephone ended the negotiations. The national office indorsed the strike and aided in financing it.

Daily, from July 28 until September 29, some five to fifteen hundred strikers and workers drawn from other firms picketed the shops of Michaels Stern during opening and closing hours. The firm then obtained a temporary injunction and all picketing stopped short. The shops were refilled, largely from raw recruits. The company is now suing for a permanent injunction against picketing and for one hundred thousand dollars damages for injury to business. To the defense, the trial has been at once a challenge to organized labor and an opportunity; a chance to focus around their interpretation of this strike, their interpretation of the larger program and purposes of labor in this industry.

For Michaels Stern & Co. the trial has one issue which Judge Sutherland has stated many times:

> We would like to be relieved from any obligation to have the history of the labor movement of America in this lawsuit. We are bringing it to compel these people to leave us alone and to mind their own business and to let us pursue our own way. That is all we have got into court for.

Admitting for a moment the pleasant notion of a labor union which "minds its own business" by carefully avoiding contact with employers, we need go no further than the evidence of this very trial to demonstrate that a modern business—Judge Sutherland to the contrary—does not operate in a vacuum.

For two weeks the defense pictured in detail what its counsel termed "the campaign of destruction" of August and September. Each day the background motives of the strike could be more clearly pieced together from scattered bits of evidence.

The final spark in the tinder was an alleged discharge—the last item, according to the union, in a long standing policy of discrimination and of espionage. Elvira Messina was suspected of circulating a list in the Childs Street shop to be signed by applicants for union membership. Miss Rosie Hellenschmidt, the employment manager, went to the girl's house while she was in the factory and told her mother that Elvira had sent her for this list. She learned that the girl had, in fact, possessed such a paper but that her brother had taken it to the union. The girl was brought into the office of the firm and was cross-examined.

The following morning, according to the workers' version, Elvira was told by the foreman "to get the hell out of here." The firm stated that he had no power of discharge and that the girl left of her own accord.

More than once Mr. Stern testified under cross-examination by Mr. Emory Buckner, trial lawyer for the Amalgamated, that men were not discharged for union membership.

> Question: In the years 1917 and 1918 did you order people discharged from Michaels Stern & Co. because they belonged to the Amalgamated? Answer: No.
>
> Question: You had endeavored, had you not, to weed them out whenever you expected they belonged, for nine months? Answer: I would not say that. No, sir.
>
> Question: For six months? Answer: At no time providing their work was satisfactory.

Miss Hellenschmidt confirmed this statement but testified that since 1917 she had been "interested" in the membership of the union; since February, 1919, she had "taken it upon herself" to question applicants and turn down all union members.

This young woman of twenty-four started at fourteen as an errand girl for Michaels Stern. She worked up through stock room and factory to the office, finally acquiring the position of employment manager. She has since then held a place of importance in the firm's labor policy. Shrewd and able, she has been absolutely committed to the interest of the company. She has been the one to attend, or stand on the street outside of labor meetings. Workers testified that, after going to these meetings, they never knew when they would be discharged. She visited the homes of strikers to bring them back to work and was largely instrumental in collecting a new force. She directed the searching of Lucille Mascari who was also suspected of having the famous list. She obtained the signatures of the girls on affidavits, by telling them that "all the other girls were signing them." She has been constantly in the courtroom, and, as a witness, has been self-composed and entirely without embarrassment. It was in her cross-examination, however, that the thread between Union affiliation and discharge was first made clear. Mr. Buckner ascertained that cards were kept recording the discharge of workers and asked her to make a list of these. Several days later she testified that she had gone over some of them.

> Question: What did you find (on the cards), a U or what? Answer: I have the reason why they left.
>
> Question: Yes. You say not written out. How much of the word union have you got on the card? Answer: Just U.

The names of twenty to thirty workers, discharged between January, 1918, and July 25, 1919, with similar comments, had actually been copied. It was requested by counsel for the defence; a protest was entered by counsel for the plaintiff.

"Your Honor will appreciate," he said, "that these are memoranda kept by the plaintiffs for their own information. *It is not a matter that is given any publicity.*"

The court ruling that the list was pertinent to the case,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it was passed to Mr. Buckner and cross-examination was resumed.

Buckner: In the list which you have handed me occurs frequently the word "suspicious." Does that mean that the person was suspected of union affiliations? Sutherland: I object to that, your Honor.

The Court: Well now, if that was a memorandum made by herself or a copy of some memo that she made, I think he may ask about that.

Witness: Those were all made by me, your Honor.

Buckner: Explain what the word "suspicious" means—just frankly. Witness: Why, I was suspicious of him belonging to the union or having anything to do with it.

An "inside union" had been started some years previous under the auspices of the company. How far it had functioned to further the real interests of the men will be indicated to any adjuster of labor difficulties by the virgin state of Mr. Stern's mind concerning this organization of his own workers. His replies to Mr. Buckner were notable.

Question: Did it have officers? Answer: Not to my knowledge.

Question: Did it have a constitution? Answer: No, sir.

Question: A grievance committee? Answer: Yes, sir.

Question: Who was the grievance committee in 1917? Answer: I would not remember the names of any grievance committee. . . . I met with them at different times. I don't know their names.

Question: As a matter of fact you did not see the grievance committee often enough to get acquainted with them, did you? Answer: I know the names if I refer to a sheet I have.

The company, while asserting its right to "go its own way" did not acknowledge the right of the workers to do likewise. It refused to permit them their own choice of a labor organization offering them a "just as good" union of its own. But after the strike it undertook to steer the destiny of the workers, in a manner far more unusual.

In 1914 a controversy which is ancient history to everyone in the clothing trade split the American Federation of Labor union—the United Garment Workers of America. The seceding branch became the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. A sharp struggle between the two ended in the almost complete organization of the ready made tailors of the country by the Amalgamated, while the older union, never well organized, dwindled. At the time of the Michaels Stern strike the United, according to the testimony of both sides, had a membership in Rochester of ten or fifteen workers.

A day or two after the strike the foreman in the Childs Street shop suggested to Mr. Stern that the loyal workers who remained be organized as a local of the United Garment Workers. Mr. Stern proved friendly to the idea and broached the matter to the union officials. At first an organizer summoned from New York made a report adverse to forming a "scab" local during a time of strike. Mr. Stern then went in person to New York, interviewed officials there, and as a representative of the company—not of his employees—invited this outside union to organize his shops. It was his announcement of the matured plan, in his brief talk with Hillman on Friday, that snapped negotiations with the Amalgamated.

The applications for membership in this strange alliance of union-fighting employer and the American Federation of Labor, were handed out to the workers by Miss Hellenschmidt; over one hundred dollars was advanced by the company for the initial dues. The functioning of the United Garment Workers in Michaels Stern's plants is reminiscent of the inside union, as Mr. Stern revealed.

Question: When was the first grievance committee of the United Garments Workers appointed? After September 8? Who were members of it? Answer: I don't know whether they had any grievance or not. . . . I think MacDonald was on it. I heard he was on it; I don't know who the rest of the committee was.

Question: Do you mean to say that from September 10 when the paper was signed between you and the United Garment Workers down to the present time, you don't know the members of the grievance committee? Answer: No.

Mr. Stern testified that the operation of this union had been wholly satisfactory to him.

It developed as the trial went on that this firm which claimed the privilege of independence had actively opposed the action of the other clothing manufacturers in bringing government arbitrators into Rochester during the war. Its purpose, as Mr. Stern showed under Mr. Buckner's questioning, was to prevent Mr. Hillman from representing workers then on strike in two firms entirely distinct from Michaels Stern.

Answer: I did dissent at all the meetings I attended at the Clothiers' Exchange from having anything to do with having Mr. Hillman introduced into any part of the controversy—having the Amalgamated organization introduced.

Question: You were opposed before Mr. Ripley and Mr. Kirstein got here to having them come, and you were opposed to any investigation in which Mr. Hillman might appear for anybody? Answer: Yes, I was.

Question: And the reason you were opposed to that is because you did not want Mr. Hillman to appear in any investigation, even if he appeared for Rosenberg's people and not for yourself, did you? Answer: I did not want to be a party to any dealings with Mr. Hillman or his organization. . . . I did not want Mr. Hilman to represent the workers in any concern that had anything to do with the Clothiers' Exchange.

Michaels Stern & Co. resigned from the Exchange which subsequently signed an agreement with the Amalgamated and shared in creating the office of an impartial arbitrator. They remained the one firm of any importance in the city which does not come under this plan.

The violence claimed by Michaels Stern was pictured by many witnesses. It can hardly be said to have been portrayed by a movie film which was introduced by the plaintiffs since this showed an orderly crowd divided systematically into sections and kept by the leaders in constant motion. The high peaks in the story are the pepper incident—in which pepper thrown by the crowd landed on a policeman's coat and the only man hurt was a striker knocked down by a policeman; a girl whose hair was pulled so that she had to go to the "hospital"—a room in the factory equipped with a white bed, three white chairs, and a nurse; a stone thrown through a window which did not hit anyone; the striking of a woman with a "hand-bag"; a funeral wreath hung on the outside of a worker's door during the night; the frequent calls of "scab" by the crowd and occasionally of worse epithets.

It was proved that the risk of mass picketing was taken, and that, in spite of remarkable control, the crowd gave way to some occasional disorder. However, as the net result of a "campaign of destruction" undertaken by ten thousand members of the Amalgamated in Rochester the record seems inadequate. If this is, indeed, a crowd of "reds" in action, as the defense would lead us to suppose, it seems hardly to merit the excitement of our press and the deportation program of our Government.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Following these incidents, played up from every angle by the plaintiffs, the defense opened its case with the testimony of Sidney Hillman, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. And suddenly, as if windows had been thrown wide and let fresh winds into the stuffy court-room, a new aspect of the case began. "Rosie" in her car watching for men who had the temerity to attend a labor meeting; the gum-chewing organizer of the United who occupies a front seat in court; the crowd calling out "scab" in front of Michaels Stern, are seen as petty incidents in a great movement, of which this witness unfolded the purposes and hopes. Eager to testify to these, Mr. Hillman was none the less a quiet witness speaking with dignity.

He retailed the gist of repeated conversations held during the last four years with the firm or their representatives. He had kept them constantly informed of the Amalgamated's program for the orderly settlement of all disputes. In 1915 he had described to them in detail the procedure adopted in Hart, Schaffner & Marx where the union and the firm were discovering a way to work out their relationship and keep the peace. Long before the strike he had told them:

> In my judgment the real reason for our success as an organization was because we have always regarded the interest of the industry. A labor union may sometimes successfully defeat an employer; it can never defeat an industry without defeating itself. Because we appreciate and recognize this, because we have seen to it that the interest of the industry should be properly protected and guarded; because of that we are so successful and employers deal with us.

So far from plotting the destruction of the firm, Mr. Hillman stated that "time and again" the union had held the workers back from striking, believing that Michaels Stern, like the other clothiers of Rochester, would enter into an agreement without stirring up the bitterness that lingers after such a conflict. Under such agreements all strikes are forbidden, and disputes are carried to an impartial chairman who gives his full time to the industry and is paid by both sides.

In his talk with Mr. Stern on the second day of the strike, Mr. Hillman, setting aside the immediate demands, went to the heart of the issue:

> I told him that the thing has to be met right in a big way. This strike is not the result of a small grievance as it may appear even to the workers in the shop; the whole thing is fundamental. We will either have a condition where the workers have no way for redress outside of making stoppages or strikes, or have a system where we will provide for the adjustment of all the grievances which naturally arise every day in the shop. And I told him I thought fundamentally their firm would have to decide whether they were willing to accept the new way of dealing with their labor, as the rest of the industry.

Toward the close of his direct testimony he summarized his motives for supporting the strike, when at last it broke. Mr. Felix Frankfurter, who conducted the examination of Mr. Hillman, questioned him.

> Question: Will you briefly state the purposes that moved you?
>
> Answer: My purpose was to defend the rights of our members, working for Michaels Stern & Co., to work there and maintain membership in our organization. . . . The other purpose was to bring the same conditions that our membership enjoyed elsewhere for our members working for Michaels Stern & Co.; also to protect our workers in the other shops against the unfair methods created in Michaels Stern & Co. . . . To make it possible for us to ask in other shops for justified increases in wages and to defend ourselves against the claim that was constantly being made that they cannot grant the increase because Michaels Stern & Co. does not. My purpose was to bring about the same conditions as to wages, hours, standards of work, conditions of labor, including in that security of employment, and an effort to check unemployment—all the things workers are vitally interested in. Finally the real big purpose was to bring about the same system of law and order introduced into the other shops, through permanent arbitration tribunals so that the workers might have the same opportunity for redress of their grievances. Those, briefly, were my purposes.

The defense attempted to bring out through Mr. Hillman's testimony—and to corroborate him with a mass of evidence—the achievements of the union as a whole in the five years of its existence; its working relationship with the large majority of employers, during a period of almost universal friction in industry; its constructive program of peaceful development; and, as showing the vital bearings of this evidence upon the case, to demonstrate the direct influence of the labor policy of one important firm on others in the city; and of one important market on the rest of the country.

The bulk of this material was ruled out as irrelevant. The judge narrowed the issue to the purpose of using force and the actual use of force in connection with the strike.

> The Court: The employees of Michaels Stern & Co. . . . had the right to strike. Any man has a right to quit work at any time he wants to and he does not have to give any reason for it. He may not like the color of his employer's hair. . . . That is not the issue here.

The issue of discharge was on the same grounds judged irrelevant.

> The Court: I think it will be conceded that Michaels Stern & Co. were opposed to an outside union and . . . that knowing the firm's attitude in these matters the workers deliberately affiliated themselves with outside labor unions, thereupon suffering discharge, which action was perfectly within the legal rights of the firm just as the labor union was within its rights in declaring a strike against the firm.

The significance of this case will not inhere in any decision narrowed to the legality of the picketing practiced against Michaels Stern.

Point by point it has demonstrated that a single strike does not explain itself, but is a thread in a broad pattern; and that today no large employer of men and women can legitimately ask to live to himself alone.

The legalities of such a case may set aside causes and desires, the determining human motives, and dwell on some detached symptom—a crowd yelling in a street. Therefore, it is not in a court of law that the men committed to the making of today's industrial history will find direction. At the most the court, acting as it must within fixed limits, will make certain rules of the game; on its finer strategy and its statesmanship the law is silent. In this case the rules of the game will probably be laid down about the middle of June.

In the clothing trade, industrial "chairmen" in industrial courts are trying to make the ethics of tomorrow: to limit and define the right to discharge; to limit and define the right to strike. Much water will flow under the bridge before the stamp of formal law can be put upon principles which are still in embryo.

In the meantime, in issues such as these, the sagacity of the courts is that of an individualism which is growing stale; industry itself must evolve the younger wisdom which shall infuse a new collective program.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Armenian Mandate

By LEWIS EINSTEIN

OF all the sufferers of the war, none have endured more than the Armenians, victims less of its horrors than of the Turkish Government's diabolical policy of murder. Whatever reparation can be made is due to that race, whose scattered survivors will need the world's support. It is, therefore, natural that an appeal made to the United States should touch every generous feeling. A series of circumstances readily comprehensible, points to our being the Power most desired by the Armenians to assist them in their regeneration and by our European associates to undertake this task. But the wisdom of assuming the political responsibility for this with its inevitable ramifications is another question, and it is well that there should be no confusion between the humanitarian and the material aid we ought to extend and the political control we ought to avoid.

The President who now takes such a deep interest in the Armenian question has little cause for satisfaction in his previous record toward it. He continued friendly diplomatic relations with the Turkish Government from 1915 to 1917, although fully aware of its policy of wilful murder during that time. He refrained from pointing out to Berlin its enormous responsibility in acquiescing in the Armenian massacres, through its intimate association with the Turks, and in restraining its local consuls from interfering to prevent such massacres. And though we were the only great Power that remained neutral at Constantinople during the massacres, we confined our protests to consciously ineffectual remonstrances, and to our shame remained apathetic before the most elementary duties of civilization.

Later when we entered the conflict we refrained from declaring war on Turkey and left one of the greatest moral issues of all time without so much as the expression of our indignation. The reason for our failure in this has been attributed to the wish to shield American property in Turkey and to the hope that our missionaries might be able to protect the native Christian population. But the utter fallacy of the latter idea had become self-evident from the massacres, while the possible though most unlikely destruction of American property would have been far preferable to our virtual acquiescence in the crimes committed.

Nor has the President's attitude toward the Armenians since the armistice been satisfactory in its results. His belated attempt of last August to place upon the powerless Turkish Government responsibility for the massacres, by threatening to withdraw the benefit of his twelfth point, was unhappily conceived. Apart from the fact that by his isolated action taken independently from our associates and unknown to them, he was doing the very thing for which he had blamed others, Mr. Wilson was creating the impression that he alone could decide the future fate of Turkey. Full of words of sympathy toward the Armenians, Mr. Wilson has been the unwilling cause of doing them more harm than good. By delaying the settlement of the Turkish problem and encouraging the belief that America would accept the Armenian mandate he has allowed hundreds of thousands of homeless people in the mountains of the Caucasus to live in miserable suspense. Until their fate could be decided, it has been impossible for their leaders to make any plans for repatriation or settlement. Thousands have already died, while the others are sustained only by charity, waiting the decision where their future homes are to be.

Even now it is a source of real dismay that Mr. Wilson should have accepted the offer made at San Remo and have agreed to fix certain of the frontiers of Armenia and to decide whether Erzerum is to be Armenian or Turkish. By seeking to dragoon an unwilling United States into making good his decisions he may again kindle false hopes in the hearts of the poor Armenians, while the inevitable future trouble will be laid down at our door.

The problem of Armenia is as follows: Prior to the war an Armenian population of over a million souls inhabited the mountainous region extending in a northeasterly direction from the Gulf of Alexandretta on the Mediterranean to the Caucasus, on the Russian side of which lived almost two million more. The Armenians in Turkey were hardly anywhere in an absolute majority, but were intermingled with Kurds and to a lesser degree with Turks and Arabs, Georgians and Tartars. Save for a small minority among the Armenians who belonged to secret political associations, the vast majority were peaceable townsfolk and agriculturists, whose outlook on life and capacity for improvement was immeasurably superior to that of their Mohammedan neighbors. Probably one million Armenians have either been massacred or else have perished as the result of their sufferings. Of the remainder, several hundred thousand have fled for refuge to the Caucasus where they have been kept alive mainly on American charity.* Some survivors still remain in the interior of Asia Minor. How are these refugees to be restored to their former homes or placed in new ones? They will have to be settled in a land where the existing inhabitants, who had murdered their kinsmen and seized their former belongings, must be forcibly dispossessed; new homes will have to be allotted and roads built, the soil again made fertile, flocks and herds created, looms restored. The economic requirements even to sustain life are only one side of the difficulty. Before prosperity can develop, security must be obtained in a land where brigandage, anarchy, and Turkish official incompetence have in the past been the rule.

The Armenian leaders hope to begin their new state with a million inhabitants in what is still Turkish territory. They hope eventually to increase their numbers by the conversion of the indigenous population, Kurd and Kizilbash, who have in the past been only imperfectly Islamized. They have a right to expect that whatever their number or assimilative power may be, under no circumstances will they again be placed under Turkish sovereignty, however nominal. The problem, nevertheless, is not one of recognizing this right, but of defining it and then of guaranteeing their protection.

The territory over which claim is made for the future Armenia is a vast one. At its lowest estimate, it comprises considerably more than a hundred thousand square miles. Even with its boundaries in their present undetermined state, it can be said with certainty that the Armenians will constitute a minority in such a country and that

*A recent Armenian estimate of the refugees is as follows: 360,000 in the Armenian Caucasus; 70,000 in the Northern Caucasus; 30,000 in Georgia.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the other elements in the population, mainly Kurds, are not likely to submit to Armenian or any other rule without a struggle.

With the mountainous and roadless condition of the country and the enormous distances to be traversed, one has an inkling of the nature of the difficulties to be expected before an orderly government can be created. Apart from the resentment of the Kurds at being placed under the domination of a race whom they have been used to rob, the fact that they will be encouraged to resist by the Turks in Anatolia and by the Tartars in the Caucasus renders inevitable a protracted guerrilla warfare imposing a severe strain on an Armenian state. The Armenians will find themselves an island in an angry sea, for their relations with the peoples around them and in their midst can for years to come hardly be other than hostile. The Armenian population will be settled in a land stretching from the Cilician coast northward to the Black Sea and thence to the Caucasian mountains. From the Gulf of Alexandretta to the Black Sea the distance is three hundred miles. From the Gulf of Alexandretta to the Armenian regions east of Etchmiazin, the seat of the Patriarch, is twice as far. The land is far too large for its prospective inhabitants, yet these frontiers are difficult to reduce. If the Armenians are confined to the barren mountains of the Caucasus which can ill support them, are deprived of access to the sea, and are without direct contact with their protectors, or suitable opportunity for the western education they crave, their future will be sacrificed. On the other hand, if a new Armenia is now carved out for them solely along the Cilician coast, the race will be divided in two, and the Armenians of the Caucasus entirely cut off from their western brethren.

The situation is so fluid, the possibilities so diverse, that one hardly dares to seek a solution which does not take into consideration the existing limitations imposed by recent tragic events. In spite of the high virtues of the Armenian race, their past disabilities and late sufferings have been such that one cannot expect too much from them. After having lost all that was precious to them it is impossible to suppose that the survivors will at once be able to create an orderly government in a land where this has been unknown.

While the request to take over the Armenian mandate appeals to our sympathies, it would be unwise to confuse sentiment with sense, or to feel exclusive responsibility when this is shared by every civilized state and most of all by Great Britain which secured Cyprus in 1878 nominally in order to watch over Armenian reforms which the Sultan had guaranteed. Granting that we ought to be prepared to assist the Armenians generously, there is no sound reason why we should undertake alone the political and military responsibility for one of the greatest problems of today, which we have had no hand in shaping—the future of a large part of Asiatic Turkey, the really valuable provinces of which are already taken by England and France.

Another sound reason militates against assuming this burden. Our only access to Armenia lies across the whole length of the Mediterranean, in other words, across a narrow sea where our home communications could, in case of difficulty elsewhere, be readily cut. The Armenian mandate which can hardly cover a period of less than thirty or forty years and probably much longer, presupposes that during this interval every American sent to Armenia will be at the mercy of any naval Power bordering on the Mediterranean with whom we may have trouble. It presupposes the diversion of enormous resources which could better be employed in the Western Hemisphere than in seeking questionable adventures, and a likely hostility with Russia or with whatever Power may control Russia and will seek access to warm waters across Asiatic Turkey.

Is it to the interest of America to have a new and greater Philippines in a land so inaccessible to ourselves and so accessible to our possible enemies? An American mandate for Armenia is likely sooner or later to be followed by trouble with Kurds, Turks, and Tartars which will lead us into new responsibilities in the Near East. To establish order in Armenia will mean establishing order as well in the countries adjacent to Armenia. Long after our mandate has been terminated we may find ourselves engaged in neighboring countries because of responsibilities now blindly assumed and which we will then be unable to shake off.

What then should be our attitude in Armenia? It seems clear enough. Let the League of Nations undertake responsibility for the regeneration, either under international auspices or else by selecting some European Power as its mandatory. England or France, whose interest and obligations toward the Armenians are of ancient date, whose resources and points of support lie close at hand, are both able to undertake this, though they modestly profess inability to do so. We, on our part, with or without the League, can assist the Armenians in other ways and ought to do so generously. We can supply them with economic and educational assistance, we can help to finance their loans, we can allow a legion of American volunteers to be recruited for service in Armenia. All this can be done without assuming political responsibility or involving the United States in unlimited risks in the Near East. If the League of Nations is to possess real meaning it cannot better begin its task than by assuming protection over the Armenians. If necessary let it subdivide the work of reconstruction and utilize for this purpose not only the great Powers, but small ones like Holland, Sweden, and Switzerland, for Armenia is a liability on what remains of civilization. We need not refuse our share but seek only to avoid an unlimited responsibility and the engaging of our national future in a task so remote, so precarious, and presenting such unforeseen consequences and dangers.

Contributors to This Issue

ROBERT HERRICK is professor of English at the University of Chicago.

JOSEPH IRWIN FRANCE is the Republican Senator from Maryland.

FRANK P. WALSH is a member of the New York bar.

W. E. BURGHARDT DUBOIS is the editor of the *Crisis* and an author of note.

ANNE HAMILTON COOLIDGE is a social worker who has made a special study of the clothing industry.

LEWIS EINSTEIN has been for many years in the American diplomatic service.

ORIN CROOKER is a writer from the Middle West specializing in agricultural topics.

NORMAN HAPGOOD, recently minister to Denmark, is well known as a writer and publicist.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Civilization vs Food Supply

By ORIN CROOKER

SEVERAL decades ago Mr. Petrie, the English archaeologist, pointed out that past civilizations have crumbled when they reached the point where agriculture, hampered by labor shortage and public indifference, was unable longer to meet the needs of crowded cities peopled by consumers and non-producers of foodstuffs. To the student of history, who knows that great movements in human development have a way of repeating themselves in different ages, certain of Mr. Petrie's books constitute most interesting reading in these troubled times.

Ancient Egypt, which saw the rise and fall of several distinct civilizations, was dependent upon a most intricate system of irrigation for its food supply. The red ooze which the Nile left upon the irrigated fields has been through the ages Egypt's sole means of soil enrichment. So long as the water systems were kept in repair and there was sufficient labor to man the fields, Egypt fed herself, waxed rich and strong, built mighty temples, and developed to a degree that is the wonder of all who study its remains. But with increased wealth the land of the Pharaohs neglected its agriculture. The cities became top-heavy in size compared with the rural population. Thousands of laborers toiled in the building of massive monuments and other structures who should have been handling the hoe and the plow. Each successive civilization in the Nile valley began to disintegrate when the cry for bread became acute. Each new civilization that followed its predecessor repaired the irrigating systems, developed an agriculture, and grew strong only to fall a victim several hundred years later to the same malady, which Mr. Petrie and others have called "excessive urbanization."

The Romans, who ruled the world for hundreds of years, paid the same price for their indifference toward the basic and fundamental factor of human sustenance. As the empire developed in strength and power, the luxury and magnificence of the cities attracted countless people from the countryside where few wished to remain. When Rome was at the height of her military prowess there was never a day when she was sure of keeping the wolf from the door. The situation menaced her armies, for the rural yeomanry constituted the flower of her strength. Too late, she sought to meet the situation by introducing a system of *villeinage* to the soil. The effort to compel heredity of trade proved futile. The empire, founded by Rome in Europe, went to pieces and the vast territory bounded by the Rhine and the Danube lay a vast ruin.

Anglo-Saxon civilization, which for hundreds of years has been growing in strength and power, finds itself afflicted with alarming symptoms of the same dread disease which has carried off its powerful predecessors. Thirty or forty years ago Mr. Petrie pointed out the trend of events and the possible outcome, but few gave any heed to his words. A short time before the war, Guglielmo Ferrero, the Italian historian, visited the United States and subsequntly set forth his impressions in a book entitled "Ancient Rome and Modern America." "Ancient history," he stated, "has helped me to understand America." Even this significant sentence passed unnoticed. The war, more than anything else, has opened the eyes of the world to the sad state of its cupboard and pantry shelves. Now come the figures of the new census showing the remarkable growth of the cities. Local pride in a thousand centers is stimulated. "See how we have grown," is the common boast. Yet cities everywhere find themselves short of dwellings, while on the other hand farms are everywhere abandoned. Farmers cry out in despair over the lack of help. A consuming public, East and West, berate the food profiteer. It must have a victim on whom to spill its vials of wrath which long have been sizzing around the corks because of the increased cost of food products.

Profiteering there is, undoubtedly, but above all stands out the one fact—clear, sharp, and distinct—that lack of city dwellings, shortage of farm labor, and the increased cost of food are evidences of an age-old malady—the tendency of a whole nation to grow indifferent to the basic and fundamental factor of food production. Excessive urbanization caused Egypt of the Pharaohs to weaken and perish. Time has drawn gently over its remains the shifting sands of the desert much as one covers the dead with a sheet. Rome could conquer the world, but it could not withstand the attack of the insidious foe which enticed strong muscles to drop the tools of agriculture and take up a life of ease and non-production in the cities. Already excessive urbanization has laid a firm grip upon America where Anglo-Saxon civilization bade fare to attain its full flowering.

Is the case hopeless? We believe not. Is it serious? Most certainly it is. We are sufficiently optimistic, however, to hold that our civilization has within itself the power to do that which others have found themselves powerless to effect. The cure when found will not, of course, be instantaneous. The road to recovery must necessarily be difficult and slow to follow. The lack of balance in our economic life which has been so long in the forming cannot be restored in a twinkling. The pinch of actual hunger, the cry of famishing children, may be needed to cause any appreciable number of the population to take its gaze from the glitter of the cities to the waiting fields of the open country. But this must come or our boasted glory must in time take its place in the tomb beside those of Egypt and of Rome.

Here is a problem so big and we add, so acute, that only the prompt functioning of a wise and far-reaching governmental oversight can meet it adequately. There must be coordination between *all* the factors of our economic life—railways, manufacture, distribution—not alone between those that center in the open country. The eyes of the entire nation must be fixed upon useful production and withdrawn from luxuries and non-essentials. Costly automobiles will not silence the cries of hungry children, nor will golf clubs and phonographs feed a famishing people. In time of war, patriotism finds expression in service. In time of grave peril, it ought to be possible to stimulate patriotic instinct to show itself in the production of real essentials. The war has shown us that as a nation at war we can absorb billions of dollars worth of Liberty bonds, produce untold quantities of shells and explosives, build ships in a few weeks, and operate great railway systems in a foreign land. In light of all this it seems not impossible that we can produce enough food to sustain ourselves provided we set about it with the same determination and summon to service the same brains, talent, and money that was lavished on war. It is well to think upon these things. Amid the thousand clamors of the present hour it should be recognized by capital and labor alike that the only true measure of the endurance of a civilization is to be found in the permanence and effectiveness of its agriculture.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Driftway

NOT so many winters after the armistice the Drifter found himself in London lodgings, with a fellow drifter from these shores, brooding upon the weeks that separated them from sailing. His major errand was run. There still was occupation—novels to read, poems to try to read, friends to see. The Drifter and his companion were not vacant nor were they lonely (to be either, by the way, violates the first principle of drifting). But they had a sense that some neat piece of human research remained to be done. Now what? The companion spread a sheet of the *Times* over the hole in the wall in front of them, for draught; there was a flicker, and "Personals" stood out. "The Agony Column," remarked the Drifter, "sustained Sherlock Holmes. Why not us?" The companion was skeptical. Often enough the column sounded like fun, but doubtless it masked a deadly seriousness; only lost souls, and the want ad clerks themselves, contributed. "Such as don't mean to marry or murder," he said, "will mother us. Are we so desperate?" The Drifter had his way, and this appeared one morning: "Two Americans, young, literary, but interested in everything, desire London friends." The crucial words were "young," "literary," and "but." "Literary" would disgust insurance agents and other gold-diggers; "but" would puzzle the refined and scare the highbrows. "We never shall smile again," promised the companion. Forty-eight hours brought fifty notes, and the heart of London lay open. Was it gay? Was it curious? It was curious. Suburban jazz instructresses needed to know the latest in their line from Broadway. Friendless typists wanted Sunday walks. Four young ladies, tired of mother and father, were in the mood for Canada, future or no future. Americans, "also stranded," reached a hand. Dear old ladies, seeing the young men must be lonely, would make their city next best to a home. Barristers from the Temple would show the Law Courts and the Parliament. As for the rest, they were merely refined. Not one word had a wink in it. The companion was vindicated, it seemed; there was no fun in personals. The boat day came, and the aliens sailed; but these tantalizing lines ran in the *Times* the next week: "Two Britannias, young, anything but literary, think two Americans probably not interesting." Now the Drifter, who never resented advice, needs and begs it.

* * * * *

THE Drifter has never in all his wanderings seen or heard Eugene Debs. Nor has his political faith ever embraced Socialism. He remembers the day when, as an undergraduate, under careful newspaper and professorial guidance, he considered Eugene Debs a most terrible menace to society and interstate commerce—this in 1894, during the railroad strike in Chicago. But the Drifter confesses to having been powerfully drawn of late years to this simple, kindly man, so dignified, so uncomplaining, so Christian and contented in his unjustifiable prison. It is not difficult to understand just why it is that this man has so extraordinary a public following, why multitudes fairly worship him today, all the more because he is behind the bars. Take his recent statement in Atlanta jail—how many men could have joked as easily about the nomination for the Presidency under his conditions? "I will be a candidate at home in seclusion. It will be much less tiresome and my managers and opponents can always locate me. . . . Now I am always in. My present location is fixed for the next nine years." And when someone suggested the possibility of pardon, Debs said: "Blessed are they who expect nothing because they will not be disappointed." And then there came the flash of the old determined courage:

> I am against war, I am a traitor, no doubt, in the eyes of Attorney General Palmer and the Department of Justice and perhaps some of the American people. But the words, "thou shalt not kill" mean to me just what they say. I would not kill in defense of my own life and certainly would not hire to some one else. I am against war, and I would go to the gallows without the slightest qualm of fear, preaching my opposition to war.

In these words lie the sum of his crime. For nothing else was he sentenced. Yet multitudes daily pray for him and bless him, and daily multitudes contrast him with the vindictive, broken, and unhappy man in the White House, wrecked in prestige and power, who sent Debs to jail and refuses to pardon him. How infinitely superior is the lot of Eugene Debs!

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Justice Should Begin at Home

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In reading in this morning's *Times* the remarkable telegram which eighty-eight of our Congressmen have sent to Lloyd George in reference to Ireland, I especially note the following:

> "With the profound conviction that further wars and acts of wars should be avoided, and believing that wholesale arrests without arraignment or trial disturb the peace and tranquillity of a people, are destructive of human rights, and are at variance with that principle of liberty which is embodied in the United States Constitution, in the provision that no person shall be 'deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law,' the undersigned . . . protest against further imprisonment without arraignment or trial . . . and ask in the spirit of American freedom and love of justice . . . that hereafter if arrests based upon acts of a political nature are made in Ireland, by color or any form of authority, the right of trial shall, without unreasonable delay, be accorded to the accused."

Do you not think it would be well to mail to each of the eighty-eight Congressmen whose names are given, a copy of *The Nation* telling of the detention in Detroit of over one hundred men, for two or three months, without warrants and without trials, and also a copy of *The Nation*, which came out sometime last winter, telling of conditions in Santo Domingo under the rule of Secretary Daniels? The "spirit of American freedom and love of justice" has much to do at its very own doors.

I notice, among the names given, those of several who are interested in impeachment proceedings against Mr. Post because he has shown a "spirit of American freedom and love of justice."

New York, May 5 E. M. AGNEW

Last Call for Dinner

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Poland's unjustifiable plunge into Russia makes one think of what Edmund Burke said about the partition of Poland in 1772. "Poland," said Burke, "is a breakfast for the great armed powers, but where will they dine?"

Russia may afford a breakfast today, but where will Poland dine?

New York, May 25 JESSE SCHWARTZ

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even as Here

By JEANNETTE MARKS

This is the end to which I come—
I who have loved beauty all my days:
This grief of tortured flowers,
This prison box devised by men,
These nails and hasps and graven plates,
This narrow room, these curious eyes,
This tolling bell,
These mumbled words miscalled of God,
This brutal stone!

O, rather, Love,
Lay me on sweet-burning cedar,
Free, fragrant with beaded pitch where the clean axe cut,
With flame that leaps from singing heart of wood to mine!
Then cast me as ash upon the quilted colors of the autumn hills,
And I shall be pale lace of wind
To kiss your lips, your eyes once more!

Or strew me on water
Till I know again its slipping hands of dream,
And see its golden deep of sand shadowed with memories,
And feel its cradling touch soft as your moving breast
In closeness beyond the reach of words!

Or toss me as a feather
To some little shepherd moon and flock of stars
Where, in the slow-rolling of prodigious hours
Round the blown crust of other worlds,
Space beyond space,
I shall find you—even as here!

Books

Our Russian Policy

Russian-American Relations, March, 1917-March, 1920: Documents and Papers. Compiled by C. K. Cumming and Walter W. Pettit under the direction of John A. Ryan, J. Henry Scattergood, and William Allen White. Harcourt, Brace and Howe.

WE still live under war powers; we are drugged by six years of propaganda; and it remains difficult to introduce even a minimum of sanity into the news. In putting out this volume the League of Free Nations Association makes it possible for the reader to learn something about the Russian question, which he often wishes vainly that he did know something about. The person who reads the documents through, with a reasonable power of attention, and some memory of events, will be led to interesting conclusions, especially if he is at all addicted to thinking in terms of history and political principle. Also he will be enabled to read the daily news from Poland and Russia, from Paris and Washington, with a becoming amount of distrust.

The collection is limited in its purpose to the relations between the United States and Russia since the March revolution of 1917, but it inevitably indicates also the relations to Russia of Britain, France, Italy, and to a slight extent Japan. It is made up entirely of authentic documents, and therefore is not encumbered with the far-famed melodramatic plot known as the Sisson documents. Nor does it include the purely propaganda statements put out by the State Department from time to time, either openly or in the form of inspired press dispatches. The whole question of Mr. Bakhmetev's present relation to the United States Government, with the accompanying question of how much American money he has spent on propaganda in the United States, lies outside the scope of the present collection. This moderation in aim is an excellence, for not the most vindictive interventionist could deny the impartial, objective nature of the information now made conveniently accessible, and much of it made for the first time available.

In judging the part played by the United States in the disastrous Russian policy pursued from Paris it becomes necessary to separate the President from his State Department. When Mr. Lansing was removed on a technicality there may have been reasons why the President did not care to go into the difficulty that the Secretary of State had found in adapting his own ideas to those of his chief. Mr. Lansing's views on the treaty, on Mexico, on Russia, were honestly and disinterestedly held, but it can scarcely be contended that his gospel was "the new freedom." His views on two of these predominant subjects are not in question here, but in reviewing a volume of this kind it is impossible to make sense of the subject without making a distinction between the President's treatment of Russia and the State Department's treatment of her. I am limited in what I may say by the diplomatic proprieties, but the facts that are public property are sufficient. A person going through this collection would receive but a slight glimpse of the policy by virtue of which the United States has gained the reputation, in liberal circles all over the world, of being so set upon the blockade and other reactionary Russian polities. The President himself emerges as a statesman who has always seen the situation justly, with the same tolerance that he has shown to Mexico. No doubt a theoretical socialist dictatorship is distasteful to him, and he has (temporarily at least) believed the stories of atrocities officially presented to him; but in a big way he has been steadily against intervention and steadily in favor of self-determination by the Russian masses. When a war against Germany, with one front in Russia, slipped so gradually into a war against Russia because she was communist, no statesman, however well-disposed, could avoid complications. The steady stream of lies, sent often by officials, naturally anti-socialist in their sympathies, made it difficult to know even the important facts quickly. The alleged arming of enemy prisoners in Siberia is an instance. It took some time for even a free-minded person to learn how entirely misrepresentative and unsupported by the people were Kolchak, Denikin, and the long line of other anti-Bolshevist leaders. It is rumored that the President even believed the Sisson documents to be genuine. The vast scope of a large number of the problems pressing on him could well make it possible for him to trust certain subordinates at times when independent investigation would have shown how inadequate were those particular minds to a subject so new and overwhelming. Reading through these documents, one is driven to believe that if the President's heart had been wrong on Russia the Paris Council would have done much more for the reactionaries than it did do. If he had been active alone, or alone with Lloyd George, there would have been a different story. Every step toward solution was frustrated by France, usually supported by Italy and Japan, with occasional timely help from the Churchill-Northcliffe-Curzon element in England. Even today we see the same drama enacted, France giving rein to Poland, while Lord Robert Cecil, most trusted of British statesmen, openly protests, demanding that Poland submit to the League of Nations, and asserting that the Bolsheviki obviously desire peace. Lord Curzon, as dangerous in his spirit as Pichon or Sonnino, has the calmness to reply to the effect that after beckoning Poland into Russia one moment it is unbecoming to call her off the next.

It may well be that such desperate failures of the League have much to do with the President's irreconcilable attitude on our not becoming part of it unless in a spirit that will throw

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon us as big a share of the responsibility as is borne by any other country. Poland's treatment of Soviet Russia is as fruitful an instance as could be desired. Either these matters are our business or they are not. Such is the dividing line between President Wilson, on the one hand, and either Senator Johnson or Senator Lodge on the other; and there could be no more acid test. We can scarcely reach the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November without a "show-down" on Russia. Such a clarification would include: (1) our relation to the League of Nations; (2) our relation to the blockade, or as the State Department has heretofore preferred to call it, our refusal to grant export licenses or passports for Russia without being guided by political considerations; (3) the possible connection of commerce with Russia to our relation to the Bolshevist Government. These last two points seemed on the road to gradually solving themselves in February last, when Mr. Berkenheim and Mr. Lloyd George reached their agreement in Paris, but since then the Moscow authorities have (apparently against the advice of Lenin and Krassin) taken an uncompromising communist attitude toward the cooperative associations, putting forward two reasons: one that the agreement reached with the cooperatives was being politically exploited to weaken the Soviet Government, the other that the plotting of France with Poland, Finland, and Rumania made political and economic centralization in Russia a practical necessity. Thus does intervention, however disguised, ever make for the death of liberty and the postponement of civil health.

There have been recently published certain documents to which I may refer, since during my diplomatic service I had no knowledge whatever of their existence. Their importance is that they definitely illustrate in documentary form the following points: (1) that Sazonov, chief reactionary Russian influence in Paris, felt free to complain of so moderate a person as Minister Morris because he collected and stated all the news, instead of using his legation as a mere propaganda bureau; (2) that Mr. Bakhmetev, acting under Sazonov, lodges this complaint with the State Department; (3) that the Department assures Mr. Bakhmetev that Mr. Morris ("and especially Hapgood") were known to be "radical personally," but that neither of said incumbents enjoyed any confidence or influence at the Department, which adhered steadily to its policy of supporting "our Government," meaning, of course, the Kolchak Government. This was last October. Since the death of Kolchak it is not clear what the policy of the State Department is. My own belief is that Mr. Colby is intelligent, and will some time clean out the nest of reactionary bureaucrats, in certain minor positions, who keep up the energetic representation of a Russia consisting largely of Mr. Bakhmetev; but when Poland is burning up Europe, time is somewhat important. The Bakhmetev-Sazonov type of Russians regret Polish imperialism, in so far as it means annexation, or pretends to mean Ukrainian independence, but they favor it in so far as it means that any intervention catspaw remains, and they bitterly resent news not furnished or colored by them. Their policy is comprehensible, but it is not American. However, it has undoubtedly been the inspiration of routine State Department policy, in contrast to steps taken directly by the President, or by certain persons responsible immediately to him.

It can, of course, be said that the President is responsible for the State Department's policy, which is true technically, but has a different meaning. It gives us a hope of internal changes that will make the personnel of the Department responsive to the President's kind of thought. To illustrate its present propaganda practices I quote two of the latest things I have seen. One was in the New York *Tribune*, as follows:

WASHINGTON, May 17—Xenophon B. Kalamatiano, of Chicago, formerly connected with the American Consulate at Moscow as commercial adviser, is in solitary confinement in the Bolshevik prison at Moscow, where he has been for a year and a half, the State Department was advised today. Kalamatiano's health is so undermined that his immediate release is imperative. News of Kalamatiano's condition was communicated to the legation by Lady Marling, head of the British Prisoner's Relief Committee in Russia. He is said to be held on a wholly unfounded charge of espionage.

Those with exceptional memories will recall that this is a warmed-up story, over a year old, which would scarcely have appeared as a special dispatch now were it not for the Polish offensive. It would be interesting to know the meaning of "wholly unfounded."

I preface my second illustration with the statement that it would be easy to fill this issue of *The Nation* with illustrations of the rush of propaganda from Washington, not going further back than the Polish preparations. The idea of trading through the cooperative associations, for example, was treated with scant courtesy for over a year after it was urged by Mr. Berkenheim, but now that it has struck a snag in Moscow itself that snag is being used as propaganda in favor of refusing trading licenses and passports. Almost all American newspapers made the most of the report of the cooperative representatives, sent to Moscow by Mr. Berkenheim, and it was undoubtedly damaging; but how many American newspapers told us that, after receiving that report, the representatives of the Russian cooperatives in England, who stood to lose personally by the action of the Bolsheviki, nevertheless urged upon the world the necessity of facilitating trade with Russia, however the Bolsheviki might treat the cooperative movement?

On May 21 the New York *Times* published a special dispatch from Washington using this cooperative report as the basis for a violent abstract of the situation. The report had been published by Mr. Bakhmetev's paper, *Struggling Russia*, on May 15, with the allegation that it was complete. It was not. A paragraph urging commercial intercourse was omitted. Also this paragraph was not referred to in the *Times* "Special," although the report in practically its complete form appeared in the New York *Evening Post* on May 15. On Sunday, May 23, the *Times* made another article out of the report, not mentioning the trade resolutions based on it by the cooperatives to whom it was made, and leaving out of the report itself the paragraph urging foreign trade. The same issue contained a special news dispatch from Washington telling how consistent the Bolshevist victories over the Poles were with an immediate Bolshevist collapse. I should much like to see a direct answer from persons in authority to this question: was Colonel Ryan's report, which has been used so hard for propaganda purposes of late, in any way supplemented before it was published?

I am not blaming the newspapers. Where there is a "news" mill, as there is in Washington, it is natural for the press to take what comes out of the mill. Newspaper men will be among the greatest gainers from this collection of the League of Free Nations Association, and it is to be hoped that a new edition from time to time will include the important documents up to date. Perhaps the approaching campaign will furnish such documents. Time moves rapidly, but as these words are written, Mr. McAdoo is the only candidate I happen to know of who has already said flatly two things: (1) that we should not take part in any form of intervention; and (2) that trade should be encouraged. The issue, when it enters politics here, should deal not with past errors but with our policy now. And it will do no good to state an American policy in one direction if a flood of propaganda comes out of Washington, with official sanction, in the other direction; so we must have both sound policy and reorganization.

While the greatest value of this volume is in connection with current policy, it has some importance from the point of view of history, including documents translated from the Russian, and notably a much fuller publication than Colonel Robins had made before of the documents passing between him, Ambassador Francis, and their associates in the Russian work of 1917-8. Colonel Robins appears as a man in real touch with the Rus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sian people, a sound prophet, a furnisher of admirable and disregarded advice, and a thinker broad enough to see that policies opposed to his own beliefs might nevertheless be policies that it was not our business to frustrate. One of the myst ries needing to be cleared up is the treatment accorded to Colonel Robins when he returned to the United States.

Sad indeed is the story that emerges from these pages. We see the Russia of Kerensky, fainting from her losses, relentlessly urged forward to continued war for the purposes of the western Powers; the Soviets, already strong in the spring of 1917, pleading continually the longing of the masses for a peace not based on pride or the lust for force, and always insulted and rejected; Brest-Litovsk and the far-seeing mind of Lenin; the crumbling of the anti-Bolshevist armies; the greater success of the anti-Bolshevist lies; the cynical determination of Clemenceau and his *Machtpolitik* abettors to have their way at any cost and to the end; the futile efforts of the President and Lloyd George to lead the Entente into the path of reason; the steady and almost comic propaganda from Washington flying directly in the teeth of what was being attempted by Wilson, Lloyd George, Smuts, Cecil, and later by Nitti. For a refrain we have the British Prime Minister's comment on the encircling and blockading policy of the French: "This is not a health cordon; it is a death cordon."

NORMAN HAPGOOD

Lovers and Loathers of Erin

Ireland a Nation. By Robert Lynd. Dodd, Mead and Company.
An Irishman Looks at His World. By George A. Birmingham. Hodder and Stoughton.
Red Terror and Green. By Richard Dawson. E. P. Dutton and Company.
Ireland an Enemy of the Allies? By R. C. Escouflaire. E. P. Dutton and Company.

TWO such different and yet, in various ways, such excellent presentations of the case of Ireland as those in the books of Mr. Lynd and of George A. Birmingham (as Canon Hannay prefers to be known) can scarcely be found. Mr. Lynd, a Belfast man by birth and a London journalist by profession, is nevertheless a passionate Nationalist. In the short sketch he furnishes of Erin's story, the fire-breathing words that come to his lips are those of an avenger of ancient wrongs. According to his view the Turks in Armenia, the Cossacks on a raid, the Germans in Belgium, have been outdone by the British in Ireland. The union of the two islands has been "that of a shark with its prey"; and the worst century of all was the nineteenth, when "population fled, wealth emigrated, taxation increased, the fields went out of cultivation, hundreds of thousands of people perished by famine, hundreds of thousands of others were evicted, the language sank into decay, the national culture dwindled." The curing of this ulcer, the draining of this pestilential swamp, is a matter not for English decision alone, but for the world. "If Ireland is not taken seriously and given her freedom equally with every other nation in Europe, another great world war is as certain as the rising of tomorrow's sun." We [the English] have made Germany disgorge her prey and loosen her hands from her victims' necks; why, asks Mr. Lynd, do we not do the same ourselves? "Not one nation," he asseverates, "outside America, has performed a single act of renunciation." They are all suffering "from the terrible disease of possessiveness." And the peace that was to make the world safe for democracy and for small nations alike has but proved the grave of all their hopes. "If a roomful of criminals had gathered together deliberately to concoct a plan for another world war within the next century, they could hardly have acted differently from the stupid and short-sighted statesman who had the destiny of the world in their keeping at Versailles."

The remedy for this is simply to act justly. Ireland *is* a nation and must be recognized as such. "There is, as regards Ireland, simply no 'British case' which an honest man can state. Even an almost fanatical pro-Englishman like myself," testifies our author, "has been unable to discover one." Ireland has the same right to her own freedom and self-determination that England has; the stronger country has no more right to keep the weaker in slavery for "strategic reasons," for her own profit and security, than a strong man has the right to make a slave of a weaker one, or of a woman, for his own advantage. With all she has lost, Ireland has kept her soul; and how vividly does Mr. Lynd paint it forth on his canvass! Unforgettable, because so true, are his pen portraits of typical Irishmen, of Sir Edward Carson with his "offensive and defensive alliance with the Deity," of Pearse the poet patriot, of Kettle who died in Flanders hoping thereby to die for Ireland, of Dora Sigerson with her weird music, and of many others.

After the blaze and blast of the Nationalist's wrath, the words of the gentle philosopher fall as thick as snow. No cup of fiery usquebaugh is drawn by Birmingham, but a goblet of nepenthe, spiced ever so delicately with wit. He has no policy to propose, though he fears that his neutrality will expose him to the scorn of the smiter and of those that pluck off hairs. He loves every sod of the old country, but he does not think that any special form of government or of law is needed to keep the nation in health and happiness. With the skepticism of a Montaigne he juggles with all the "solutions" of the Irish problem proposed, but does not heartily espouse any one of them. But if he hesitates to prescribe the remedy, he makes a wonderful diagnosis. If he does not side with or against Sinn Fein he can explain its existence and triumph. England can never kill Nationalism with kindness, he thinks, because to the Nationalist "anything that tends to make Ireland content with the Union is in the nature of a bribe. All that is best in him rises up in protest against the doctrine that it can profit a nation to gain the whole world, if in gaining it she lose her own soul."

Sinn Fein is the child of many spiritual ancestors, some of whom would hardly recognize their offspring. Thus Jim Larkin, the labor leader, who never cared much for nationalism, really gave great power to its elbow by training the native proletariat to a sense of its power. Again, the Gaelic League, ridiculed as it was for trying to make the population speak a language native only to a few peasants who were rather ashamed of it, in digging up the soil for the buried treasure of ancient Erse civilization did not find that, but prepared the field for a marvelous crop of national self-consciousness. Sir Horace Plunkett, with his Agricultural Society, while professing to care for nothing but dairy products, brought home to the peasant farmer a sense of the necessity of self-reliance that indirectly redounded to the advantage of the republicans.

Our author cannot see that Ulster has anything to fear from a Dublin Parliament. It is far more likely that Belfast would bully Dublin than that Dublin would oppress Belfast. But whether it comes in or not, Ulster cannot help doing its part to the growth of Irish culture. Sad, and perhaps exaggerated, are the tones in which this loyal son speaks of the decay of his nation; it is a case of arrested development, he thinks, as plainly shown in its religion, its art, its literature. But even here there is hope in such sound institutions as Trinity College and in the native aristocracy. Perhaps he is right; perhaps not. *Que sais-je?*

Between the lovers and the loathers of Erin how wide a gulf! Mr. Dawson hates Ireland and he knows it. He has made a study of the Nationalist movement as thorough as it is merciless. Little recks he of the past: but of the present generation his knowledge is deep and broad. The violent swing in the direction of Irish independence takes its origin, or at least derives its force, in Mr. Dawson's opinion, from several untoward events which began to happen less than a generation ago. As he sees it, the first of the parents of Sinn Fein was the Gaelic League. In discovering Ireland's ancient tongue, the antiquaries changed her mind, as well. But the League would have remained unfruitful had it not found a mate to engender with,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Irish labor movement. Thus were combined the two elements, the intellectuals and the proletariat, necessary to lay the train of revolution. It was Larkin, sentenced the other day to an American prison for "criminal anarchy," who made the causes of Irish nationalism and of Irish labor one. As Sinn Fein derives its force from its alliance with the sansculottes, it is destined, Mr. Dawson thinks, to wither away when labor chooses to assert itself in its own name. Hence arise the alliances, more or less disavowed, between Sinn Fein on the one hand and first Germany and then Russia on the other. Sinn Fein is Bolshevism, terrorism, and assassination.

Where Mr. Dawson argues like a lawyer, M. Escouflaire orates like an actor "in Ercles' vein, a tyrant's vein, a part to split a cat in." His indictment of Ireland is inspired by a terrible passion of hatred such as few Englishmen have ever expressed. The Irish are a barbarous, wicked race, who, to all the crimes and vices in the Newgate calendar, have added the Judas-like treason of trying to stab the Allies in the back at the crisis of the struggle with Germany. In the beginning, he assures us, they were savages, practising polygamy and incest. Since then they have never been really tamed, but have always lagged a few generations behind the civilization on the rest of the world. Have they been cruelly treated? "Good heavens! The Irish have no monopoly of wrongs. Other people have suffered too." They are madmen who can only be ruled by force, and who are made worse by kindness. Ireland must be held down firmly, and "if she howls, let her howl. She will then attempt another rising —and perhaps will have to be brought to reason more or less harshly, more or less brutally. She will howl louder than ever." Her appeals for our sympathies are frauds: "the Irish question is an international imposture."

Lovers of England must trust that she will not listen to such counsels as these. Let her turn rather to her own greatest statesman, Edmund Burke, to learn the principles of true wisdom and of true morality applied to the treatment of a dependent nation. From his thought, expressed in language of sublime beauty, she will learn that one cannot indict a whole people; that a people never rebelled from sheer wickedness but only under strong provocation; that peace must be sought not through the sword but in her natural haunts; that refined policy is ever the mother of confusion; and that plain good intention counts for much in government. Let England now say to Ireland what Burke said of America; "I would rather have independence without war than with it."

PRESERVED SMITH

A Stable Dollar

Stabilizing the Dollar. By Irving Fisher. The Macmillan Company.

SINCE 1911 Professor Fisher has been constantly writing and lecturing on a plan for a new monetary system. In this volume he assembles his arguments and data, and gives us the latest developments. He now calls his plan "stabilizing the dollar." By a "stable dollar" he means one which will always buy, within the country of the issue, the same quantity of a representative list of commodities. His proposal involves establishing a new measure and standard of value, so controlled by Government that it shall always equal in value an "imaginary goods-dollar" or "bill of goods," or "imaginary basket of goods." The control is to be exercised through a Government bureau, which shall keep and publish a current index number of the prices of the commodities in the imaginary goods-dollar, and shall from time to time increase or diminish the quantity of gold defined as a dollar, so that a dollar certificate issued by the Government will always command that quantity of gold which will buy the imaginary basket of goods.

The underlying idea is that something can be found which will be a better measure of values than a fixed quantity of gold, better, that is, than the present dollar which is 25.8 grains of gold. The notion that there is something of substantially constant importance to man, or more constant than gold, which might serve to measure values has often been advanced. Thus Adam Smith felt that labor is "the real measure" of value. So, too, corn or breadstuff, as furnishing the staff of life, has been extolled as uniform in real value. Not a few plans to put wealth into circulation by issuing notes redeemable in things other than gold or silver have been proposed and many have been tried. The land banks and merchants' banks of colonial New England, the scheme of John Law, the French assignats, the once popular Potter's Key of Wealth, Jevons's "multiple standard" are among the partially analagous plans which readily come to mind.

The feature which differentiates this plan from most of the others which have sought to standardize "an abstract sense of value" is the method of changing the weight of gold to be called a dollar. Except in this particular the scheme is substantially only a clever adaptation of Jevons's multiple standard. Yet, strangely enough, Mr. Fisher seems willing to waive this technical feature and admits that it would be a "sound alternative" to use "paper certificates redeemable in actual goods-dollars instead of in their gold equivalent." This disarms all criticism which might be directed to the many difficulties in technical administration, but leaves one a good deal at sea as to important details.

The arguments by which he supports his project involve many and grave theoretical difficulties. Since he assumes that the gold money in circulation controls the far greater credit purchasing power in circulation, he has been vigorously attacked by the school of money theorists who believe that "credit possesses value, and it is more correct to say that the value of gold is due to its convertibility into credit than that the value of credit is due to its convertibility into gold." The quotation is from the notable work on "Currency and Credit" by the learned Englishman, R. C. Hawtrey, a book which appeared contemporaneously with the one under review. Again, since Mr. Fisher's project assumes a static condition of industry, it appeals not at all to those theorists who believe that our economic institutions, among which would be our monetary system, should be dynamic, that is, should be directed to promote and register progress.

These theoretical objections militate against accepting the plan as at all desirable. They rest somewhat on Mr. Fisher's faulty analysis of the causes of fluctuations in the general price level. He assumes that the causes of all fluctuations in prices are to be found on the monetary side of the equation alone and defies his critics to find any other causes. We may venture to offer one. Since the general level of prices is, by his own contention, a ratio between the amount of money in circulation (money and circulation both defined as he wishes), and the quantity of goods offered for sale, it is clear that a change in the quantity of goods offered for sale would influence that ratio. Fisher is, therefore, forced to assert that statistics of the volume of goods show "no progressive scarcity" during all the period of the advance in prices, or more specifically since 1896. But the statistics presented are merely measures *absolute* (static) and scarcity or plenty is a matter *relative* (dynamic). If human wants were the same from day to day and from generation to generation, the statistics he presents would be significant. But human wants multiply, intensify, and change. When we suddenly needed cotton to make explosives, as well as shirts and sheets, there was scarcity of cotton no matter how bounteous the crop. It is common knowledge that there *was* scarcity of cotton, sugar, wheat, fats, iron, wool, leather, and other staples during the war, not so much because of any decrease in physical volume thereof as because of a diversion to new uses. In proportion to the ever-multiplying wants, new wants, of the race, the products we can wring from niggardly nature, hampered as we always are by the law of diminishing returns, *are* growing progressively scarcer. If the race would stop multiplying its wants, Mr. Fisher's statistics would have the meaning he imputes to them. But the peoples of the world

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make constantly new uses of nature's products. They *will have* automobiles and aeroplanes.

We must not be understood to underrate in the least the tremendous effect on prices due to monetary disturbances during the war, which is a problem entirely by itself. Nor do we deny that monetary changes have had a part in the steady rise in prices through these many centuries, and even between 1896 and 1914. But monetary changes have not, as Mr. Fisher contends, been the only causes. Quite aside from monetary conditions the rise in prices reflects in a perfectly normal and healthily stimulating manner the ever-increasing difficulty that the race encounters, not so much in *getting* a living as in getting a *better living*.

The theoretical difficulties throw doubt on the desirability of Mr. Fisher's plan. But aside from all that, we believe it to be impracticable. Our reasons for this belief lie in the nature of index numbers and their known weaknesses. His basic "imaginary goods-dollar" is to be computed by an index number of prices, a device now so familiar as not to need description. While the making of index numbers is an art which has greatly improved, it is very far yet from a perfect art. It has been partially perfected in a few fields. But even as to such partial index numbers experts are not in agreement. An index number must be designed for the purpose it is to serve. Some of the most successful ones are designed to measure the changes in the cost of living of workingmen. The best of these are not satisfactory to the workingman whom they are designed to serve. Some others measure the fluctuations in foreign trade, and still others the ups and downs of business prosperity. No index number extant assumes to measure the general level of all prices, and that is what would be needed. Should such an index number include all commodities and wages as well, consider capital investments, rents and interest payments, or be confined to commodities alone? If the latter, should it include finished products only, or raw materials as well, or raw materials only? These are a few of the unsettled questions. Mr. Fisher does not face this problem squarely. One gathers that he thinks any old index number will do. For he argues that there is substantial consistency in all of those we now have. But while there are remarkable consistencies, it does occasionally happen that one goes up when others go down, and, what is more vital, it is seldom that any two go up or down the same amount. One index number may advance 10 per cent, and another 12 per cent. This is not a large difference, to be sure, but enough to make or mar a profit. When it is a matter of the rough adjustment of a wage scale into the determination of which other considerations of equal or even far greater weight enter, such differences are not important. Quite different would be the case of the "imaginary goods-dollar."

Mr. Fisher submits as a sample of what he means by a general index number a list of some seventy-five commodities. He proposes that the general index number should include only articles "promptly responsive" to influences causing changes in prices and exclude "articles sluggishly changing." We may therefore ask why he omitted potatoes from that list. They are important because nearly everyone eats them at least once a day. They are certainly not "sluggishly changing." Yet he includes flaxseed and opium! The reason for omitting potatoes is easily guessed by anyone who has had much to do with making index numbers. It is because this temperamentally Irish commodity raises more riot in an index number than any half-dozen others put together. It will sometimes drive the index number hither and yon against the combined will of all the other more reliable articles. This illustrates very forcefully how much of judgment and of personal opinion there may be in the making of an index number. Because he doesn't like its behavior, Mr. Fisher omits the mealy tuber, and for the same reason the Bureau of Labor drowns it in a mass of other price quotations. In either case the resulting index is made to behave as its maker thinks it ought to behave. The imaginary goods-dollar is thus imaginary in two senses.

But there is an inherent defect in index numbers which Mr. Fisher underrates. In all progressive communities they become rapidly antiquated. A list of commodities intended to show the relative importance of things in the days of Washington would be as out of date today as Washington's wig. A few years ago any index number designed to measure the changes in the purchasing power of money would probably have included alcoholic beverages, for they certainly made money circulate. Who will say what should be set in the list in their place? Are they not irreplaceable in more ways than one? Not many years ago the movement of beef prices was always closely reflected in the price of salt beef, and a good index number would have included it. Cold storage has made salt beef a rarity today. The famous Aldrich index number, designed by the way to be a basis for a study of the tariff and used for the very different purpose of defeating Mr. Bryan, was criticized for containing too many jack-knives, an important protected article. If automobiles become as common as jack-knives once were, should not they go in the list? But in place of what article? Statisticians have devised methods for adjusting these changes. But again, the adjustment is a matter of judgment, discretion, opinion, and—be it confessed—of guesswork.

There is still a third practical difficulty which it seems Fisher underrates. To work at all the new standard must be a legal tender. It is inconceivable that Congress would leave the entire content of the new legal tender dollar to a disinterested commission of experts. Since the weights do make a difference, the cotton, wheat, iron, coal, copper, and other representatives would have an interest in the weights. Statisticians are agreed that unbiased errors in the weights usually offset one another. But biased weighing is admittedly fatal. There is some danger that the imaginary dollar would turn out to be merely a political dollar.

While Mr. Fisher's present project is unsound, undesirable, and impracticable, his simple and forceful presentation of monetary evils will, one may hope, arouse interest and stimulate thought. What is needed is sound credit, based on sound banking, and that in turn on sound business. If in the language of our Federal reserve act our money is based on bona fide (and sound) commercial transactions, we need worry but little about the denominations in which the units of value are expressed, and our old gold dollar is safe enough.

CARL C. PLEHN

Mercier

Mercier. The Fighting Cardinal. By Charlotte Kellogg. D. Appleton and Company.

Cardinal Mercier's Own Story. By Cardinal Mercier. George H. Doran Company.

TWO men showed themselves during the war able to voice men's sense of right. One was the earlier President Wilson; the other was the Primate of Belgium, Cardinal Mercier. What this meant when all values seemed to be changing, when events altered standards from day to day, when force had rights and rights had not force, can be partly gauged from Cardinal Mercier's story of the Belgian occupation as told in the letters interchanged between himself and the German authorities. Here is an actual record of fact as it appeared at the time. Here is the history of the imprisonment of priests, of the deportations of Belgians to Germany, of German oppression in all its variety. Most of all, here the unvarnished story of a man who, unchanging amid change, not only upheld his own standards, but in the end vanquished with it the occupying foe. "You are in our estimation the incarnation of occupied Belgium," writes Baron von der Lancken, shortly before the armistice, "of which you are the venerated and trusted pastor. For this reason it is to you the Governor General and my government also have commissioned me to come and to announce that when we evacuate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

your soil we wish to hand over to you unasked and of our own free will the political prisoners serving their time either in Belgium or in Germany, as well as those who have been deported."

This was the happy ending to the drama which for four years had unrolled itself in the formerly sleepy town of Malines. Cardinal Mercier had only himself to look to for guidance. In the face of German force he had to hold high the Belgian honor, conscious that such an attitude frequently brought retribution upon those whom he sought to protect. From Rome he could expect but little support. Thus day by day for four years he had—apart from any question of personalities—to hold up the truth to enemy and to friend, and incidentally he had to be an exceeding clever man continually to frustrate the attacks of the Germans upon him. The keen brain, the strong sense of right, and the truth that was in him helped him through intact. Amid all the heroism, all the sordidness of war, there emerges this clear spirit, a light in a world even now only groping its way in the darkness.

Mrs. Kellogg's little book, with its personal touches, forms a useful pendant to the Cardinal's letters. Mrs. Kellogg's work for the relief of Belgium brought her constantly in close and sympathetic touch with Cardinal Mercier, and her sketch of his whole career completes one of the most admirable and touching figures of the war. Of particular interest is her account of the difficulty encountered by the Cardinal concerning his journey to Rome. At first much against a visit which might influence the Pope adversely to the German cause, the Germans finally decided that such a visit offered an excellent opportunity for getting rid of a constant thorn in their side. They reckoned without their host. The Cardinal obtained not only permission to go to Rome, but also permission to return again to his suffering people. Centuries hence Cardinal Mercier will figure as one of those heroes of romance which no one ever believes really to have lived in his own time.

MURIEL HARRIS

Our National Parks

The Book of National Parks. By Robert Sterling Yard. Charles Scribner's Sons.

The Grand Canyon of the Colorado. Recurrent Studies in Impressions and Appearances. By John C. Van Dyke. Charles Scribner's Sons.

ONE of the proudest achievements of Congress has been the creation of our magnificent series of National Parks, ranging all over the United States and to Alaska and Hawaii. Heretofore there has been no single volume treating all these, and Mr. Yard's is, therefore, a welcome reference and descriptive book much needed. There are many beautiful illustrations from photographs, and one drawing by a painter. The text presents entertaining descriptions of each of the great reservations, including Mt. McKinley and Mt. Katmai, with the latter's Valley of Ten Thousand Smokes, the really outermost crust of hell, lying under the Alaskan skies, and Three Monsters of Hawaii, of which the greatest is Kilauea, pronounced by some to be the greatest wonder on earth next to the Grand Canyon. "These parks," says Mr. Yard, "are far more than recreational areas. They are the gallery of masterpieces. Here the visitor enters in a holier spirit. Here is inspiration." He notes the difference between a national park and a national monument, which mainly is that the park is created by Act of Congress, while the monument is established by presidential proclamation. The latter may be terminated by the President, but the park cannot be changed except by act of Congress. A park, consequently, is better protection for a natural wonder.

Each of these parks and monuments will in time have a special literature. A considerable number of books already has been written about the Grand Canyon, and Mr. Van Dyke's is an interesting addition to this number. Written with all his graceful style and imagery, it may be called a literary guide-book of a superior kind. About half the book is devoted to the rock structure of this geologist's paradise, and as these pages have not only been carefully prepared by the author but have been read in proof by Mr. Ransome, of the Geological Survey, they may be accepted as accurate, as in Mr. Yard's book there are a few errors. Two of these, perhaps, should be noted here. It is incorrect to say that the "whole length of the Grand Canyon can be traversed on these Tonto slopes," for as soon as the vicinity of the Upper Granite Gorge is departed from these Tonto slopes disappear, and are not seen again to any extent till the region of the Lower Granite Gorge is reached far down the river. To say that the Grand Canyon "proper" ends about at Havasupai Point is also misleading, for it runs on and on, ever magnificent. Around the Shewits Plateau the extent and magnificence, as well as the depth, are quite comparable to the part known to tourists around the Kaibab at the Hotel Tovar.

Mr. Van Dyke rightly condemns the Oriental names applied to the buttes and promontories. These were not given by Major Powell. All of his names were appropriate along the entire river and over the whole region, like Kaibab Plateau, Red Wall, Marble Canyon, Vermilion Cliffs. It was Major Dutton, one of Powell's geological associates, whose monographs are well known, who, not liking Amerindian names, set the pace by applying Indian names like Vishnu's Temple. Topographers later followed this lead and, though protests have been made from time to time, the unfortunate practice could not be stopped. The mythology of Egypt and India seemed more majestic to these minds than the Grand Canyon itself. It recalls the old surveyor who plastered New York State with classical names.

In both these books an old-time error is repeated to the effect that when Cardenas came to the Canyon in 1540, the first to see it, he described the river as having banks "which seemed to be more than three or four leagues above the river." The actual statement in the original Spanish manuscript of Castañeda, in the New York Public Library, is that the distance "*through the air*" from one side to the other was more than three or four leagues, just as it actually is around El Tovar. Here is the Spanish statement:

"pues como ubieron andado uiente jornadas llegaron a las barrancas del rio que puestos a el bado [lado?] de ellas pareçia al otro bordo que auia mas de tres o quatro leguas por el ayre."

The original has no punctuation and no capitals. It bears date of 1598.

FREDERICK S. DELLENBAUGH

All that Glitters

Responsibility. By James E. Agate. George H. Doran Company.

The Thunderbolt. By G. Colmore. Thomas Seltzer.

The Explorer. By W. Somerset Maugham. George H. Doran Company.

THE new novel, the novel of plastic form and moral freedom, flourishes in Britain. Omit the established elders and write down a quite random list and the fact becomes abundantly clear. There are W. L. George and Gilbert Cannan, Hugh Walpole, Douglas Goldring and Frank Swinnerton; there is the keen talent of Miss Delafield, the vague but rich one of Dorothy Richardson, the subtle and handsome mind of the remarkable woman who calls herself Clemence Dane. There are no masterpieces but there are personalities. And that is, perhaps, even better. Already, however, this plentifulness of talent and personal vision is entailing a peculiar danger. The new manner is at the command of writers whose equipment is confined to it. Rip up the tight form of the Flaubert-Moore tradition, write discursively in comparatively fresh English, use the paragraph sign which Mr. Wells borrowed from the biological text-books of his youth, and, ten to one, you will be hailed as a new master. Except in the very shallows of provincial journalism the new fiction is now in fashion and spurious limitations are at a premium.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Responsibility," by James A. Agate, is a case in point. The book was heralded by the *Saturday Review* in unmeasured terms. A "portent," a "star of the first magnitude," "ageless as genius always is." This is ecstasy—in the Shakespearean sense. Is there any contemporary novel of which such terms can be unblushingly used? "Responsibility," at all events, is not that novel. In the person of the teller of the tale, a middle-aged novelist writing in a base-hospital, the author gives us through a long introduction the moral and reflective upshot of his tale. In this introduction he displays some desultory information, an off-hand knowingness, an apparent openness of mind, and slices of thick, sentimental prejudice. Yet it was no doubt this introduction that caught the critic—a young one presumably—with its flourish of going on one of those trips of moral exploration that distinguish the better of the new novels. Mr. Agate proposes his theme, that of accidental and involuntary fatherhood, and says: "I have puzzled the nights through over any possibilities of moral deduction." He seems to have wasted his nights. The book has 317 pages. Clare, the mother of the problematic child, first appears on page 215. Up to that point the book is a rambling account of some provincial people who are cleverly enough drawn, and of the proceedings of a rather callow debating society composed of commercial youths with philosophic aspirations. Far from exhausting his ostensible subject, Mr. Agate barely touches it. He is not saturated; he is hardly splashed. The long preparation prepares for next to nothing. Then the war begins to dodge in and out of the book and it is treated quite conventionally. It heals, uplifts, purifies. The book can be read aloud in any family. But Mr. Agate has the modern air and vocabulary, and the indirect method of attack which is merely slipshod when it is not an intellectual and artistic requirement. Undoubtedly Mr. Agate has both talent and promise. Today he is not an ageless portent but a beginner with very much to learn.

"The Thunderbolt" is our second exhibit. "Imagine," says the American publisher, "trying to convey to the public for the first time an idea of those books that have become world classics." Imagine it, indeed! Well, writers for publishers' "jackets" are not commonly shrinking souls. And this particular writer had his excuse. For no less a paper than the London *Nation* declared "The Thunderbolt" to be "the most remarkable essay in imaginative fiction during the last five years." There is a dash and verve and happy assurance about such sentences that one envies. It recalls the brave literary enthusiasms of adolescence and makes one's present critical temper seem colorless and morose. But reading this "absorbing, stupendous, inimitable, flawless" book restores one's self-respect. Two-thirds of it chronicle small beer with average accomplishment. Then comes the thunderbolt—not, of course, out of the blue, but out of Germany. Mrs. Bonham and her daughter travel on the Continent. Dorie chafes her heel. Through the mistake of a servant she goes, not to a private consultation with Dr. Reisen, of Laubach, but to his clinic, where, according to a custom of his, he promptly innoculates her with syphilis. The symptoms are confirmed by Dr. Mabœuf, of Paris, who, however, will listen to no insinuations against his German colleague. All foreigners, according to the author, are apparently tarred with the same brush. But even this sorry fable is quite devoid of the melodramatic "punch," the thrill of spurious horror which was, obviously, its one attainable merit. Honestly written, it would have been a rattling shilling shocker. Aping the sober garb and earnest manners of a modern novel, it has succeeded in being hailed—for various reasons—as a masterpiece.

For Mr. Somerset Maugham one feels a kindness that nothing can destroy. He wrote "Of Human Bondage." The fame of Samuel Butler also rests upon one great book. But Butler did not weigh that book down with such masses of perishable stuff. Within a single season, following "The Moon and Sixpence," two shallow and tricky comedies by Mr. Maugham have appeared on the stage, and now he has permitted the reprinting of "The Explorer." The case of Mr. Maugham involves the one question of literary morals that has any concrete interest and reality. To violate the nobility of one's own artistic gifts and intellectual perceptions—that is deplorable. And there can be no falseness, no shadow of the meretricious, no note of mere glibness capable of escaping the unerring hand and eye that created "Of Human Bondage." He has not, we believe, the excuse of poverty. "The Explorer" is, of course, well written. The style is frugal, precise, lit by an inner clarity. The Allertons, father and son, are good character sketches. They would do credit to a lesser hand. But Lucy Allerton is a marvel of false nobility and of the aristocratic virtues dear to the imagination of the vulgar. And the explorer, Alec MacKenzie himself, is terrible. He is the stern, silent, resistless, fearless, tender, super-honorable bearer of the white man's burden, a mixture of St. Elmo and General Gordon and Kipling's official empire builders—the strong man of romantic imperialism and of the extreme type of nationalist self-glorification. And this from Somerset Maugham! Where is that difficult and saving "contact with reality" of which he has so memorably spoken? "See that thy works prove equal!" Rossetti wrote in a fine passage. The reasons which the poet gives for his grave admonition the admirers of Somerset Maugham will wish the novelist to take seriously to heart.

Books in Brief

STEPHEN LEACOCK is far from happy in his study of "The Unsolved Riddle of Social Justice" (Lane). He reveals himself as a clever man, of course, but not as a serious economic thinker. Evidently the war did not complete the work of intellectual emancipation for him. He has shaken off some of the old, easy-going assumptions, but others remain to shackle his thinking and pull him up sharp when he is at the point of arriving somewhere. The result is mere timidity. He is frightened at implications that are not very terrifying, and constantly glances over his shoulder to see how such audacity is received by his tory friends. His argument suggests the necessity for fundamental social changes, but he will have none of them. He demolishes the old classical economy, but he declines to accept a substitute. He plays prettily with the riddle, but he gives it up quite too easily. There are some excellent things in the book—things which cannot be said too often to a people long pickled in the brine of economic individualism. Probably it cannot be too often insisted that *laissez faire* is as false to the economics of America today as the philosophy of Robinson Crusoe: that price, for example, is not determined by supply and demand, but by "economic strength," or bargaining power; and that production and distribution are at the mercy of a hugger-mugger struggle for profits. How much bargaining power does the irate citizen possess who expostulates with the salesman at the cost of shoes, or who growls at the price Mr. Rockefeller charges for gasoline? So far, so good. But why does the economist stop here? Why does he not examine fundamentals: how the gap between cost and sale price tends to widen to a chasm; and how with an augmenting sale price, swollen by middleman profits piled upon factory profits, the purchasing power of wages bates and dwindles amazingly; and finally, how the advance in the mechanization of industry further depletes the wage fund until the home market cannot consume the output because the consumer's wage is only a fraction of the sale price? Recognizing some of the intolerable evils of the profit system, Mr. Leacock examines and rejects the socialist solution set forth in "Looking Backward." The appeal to human selfishness suffices to destroy all such hopes. We must sit tight, for any weakening of the present system invites chaos. Is not "the blind Samson of labor" waiting for a chance to pull down the pillars of society? Better the frying pan than the fire. The retort is easy. Why go back to Bellamy? Have we learned

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nothing since 1887? Have the psychologists not taught us that social motives are less simple than he assumes? Mr. Leacock, surely, cannot be so ignorant as this book would lead one to infer. He must know what the war did to bureaucratic socialism in England; but why has he nothing to say of the industrial state within the political state? Must the setting up of industrial parliament lead to chaos and old night? Something of it exists already in a pernicious form. When powerful groups of business men formulate policies to be legislated by a Congress which they dominate, they are exercising an unofficial sovereignty. Why not extend the system, by including labor, and legalize it? Here is a field of speculation to which we invite the writer's attention. When he has chewed the cud of such meditation, he may be less jaunty in style but more helpful in suggestion. Maybe the riddle can be solved after all.

THOUGH no great contribution to economic history is made by A. J. Morrison's "East by West" (Four Seas), the tale of Oriental trade has so much fascination in itself that it is a pleasure to read anything connected with it. What names they are to conjure with—Babylon and Tyre, Corinth and Miletus, Egypt and Carthage! Nation after nation, century after century, has drunk the intoxicating cup of the gorgeous Eastern enchantress, and has fought for her favors. How rich did Venice make her lovers with the spoils of Asia, until Vasco da Gama sluiced off the stream of wealth and turned it into the lap of Portugal! Undreamed-of riches came to Lisbon in a gale of spices from the Indies, while Spain found the reflection of the setting sun in the Western waves no less golden than her sister had found the path of his rising beams. The riotous debauch of sudden riches left the two nations weak and reeling, and the Dutch and English seized the trident from their relaxing grasp. Of late still younger nations have contended for the prize: Germany unsuccessfully, the United States with what ultimate advantage is yet to be determined. Perhaps Japan will soon grasp the golden chalice and in her turn drain the rich draught.

AS a charming girl, courted for her beauty and riches, seems ever more desirable as rival lovers strive for her favor, so Alsace has acquired an additional romantic desirableness as warring nations have striven to capture her and enjoy her charms. We have thought of the country as a picturesque toy world, where the women wear the great bows of the picture books and "Uncle Hansi" is a reality. The descriptions of Edith O'Shaughnessey in "Alsace in Rust and Gold" (Harpers) go far beyond our fairest imaginings and make us feel that we must start at once for so bewitching and colorful a land. She relates her experiences with officers of the French Military Mission as they lived through thirteen historic days preceding the armistice in Alsace in the autumn of 1918. Traveling by fast military automobiles over wonderful war roads, she records her impressions of the life in important towns and the reaction of the people to the war. Her accounts of visits to the schools where the children are being "re-Gallicized" as they learn French are of especial interest. Towards the end of the trip the news of the signing of the armistice was received when she and the members of the mission were at dinner. "We touched our glasses again, oh so quietly! The night was dark, dark. Many had gone the light, bright way of heroes." The author predicts that innumerable tourists will come from far to enjoy the loveliness of the country and "get the belated thrill."

A VALUABLE "Lace Guide for Workers and Collectors" (Dutton) by Gertrude Whiting, founder and president of the Needle and Bobbin Club, has recently been published. It is profusely illustrated with plates giving key designs, with accompanying directions to show students of lace how certain meshes are woven, to aid those planning to produce lace, and to assist classifiers and collectors in identifying laces. The book also contains a bibliography and lace nomenclature in five languages. The earliest known book on lace was that of Jörg Castel of Zwickau published in 1525. Miss Whiting pleads for the lace industry in Boston, first of all because it is a joy to the workers. "In lace-making villages the women are of superior type. They are never idle. Their manners and voices are gentle. Personal cleanliness is essential at all times. It creates no litter or untidiness. 'My mother always said that to sit down to her pillow was the best rest she could have after her work,' we have been told by the daughter of a famous lacemaker." "Art gracieux, travail bienfaisant."

A small thing may make Beauty,
Yet Beauty is no small thing,

wrote Michelangelo. If we have not the patient workers of the old world to fashion with humble needle and bobbin the beauty of the exquisite laces of Flanders and Italy, still there is an increasing interest in lace-making and lace collecting in this country, and Miss Whiting's thorough technical knowledge as imparted in this book will do much to foster the movement.

"THE Church of England: Its Nature and Future" (Macmillan) is not "a manual from which to draw a consistent body of doctrine," but is a "symposium, bringing together prominent exponents of different tendencies within the church," and agreed on nothing save in the belief that the church has a mission to perform. Of the five authors, all distinguished clergymen, the most readable is certainly the Right Rev. H. Hensley Henson, Bishop of Hereford. It is refreshing, indeed inspiring, after so much has been done to draw over the plain history of the Church of England a veil of medieval obscurantism, to see this eminent prelate enter a strong claim that the "Anglican version of Christianity" is Protestant, and "has never been Catholic since the Reformation," for "the identifying features of Catholic religion are absent from it. The Mass, auricular confession, monasticism, devotions to the saints, prayers for the dead—all are wanting." "When the Tractarians denounced the Reformation and repudiated Protestantism, they were speaking a new language, and were not unjustly accused by their contemporaries of going back on the tradition of the Church of England, and preaching novelties." The Rev. A. C. Headlam presents an interesting paper on "Some Characteristic Features of the Anglican Church," which he finds in the continuity of its life and teaching, the close association with the State, the tradition of freedom among the clergy, and the tradition of learning."

THOSE who take up "The Russian Diary of an Englishman" (McBride) with the expectation of finding valuable historical material will have their hopes seriously disappointed. They will learn that the writer is a gentleman of refined tastes and elegant manners, with an eye for the simple beauties of a sunset as well as for the more elaborate enchantments of Peterhof, that he is fascinated by the social graces of the Romanoff family and always speaks of the heir apparent as "the dear little boy," that he is a connoisseur in *objets d'art*, that he is fond of the Russian ballet and Russian caviare, and in general knows how to spend his days very delightfully. He is always lunching or dining with charming Prince This or dear Duchess That, but if anything of importance is ever said on these occasions the diarist maintains a gentlemanly silence about it. The Czar figures consistently as a very good man and is several times advantageously compared with Kerensky, only the writer cannot bring himself to overlook his failure in adversity to make *un seul beau geste*. The same critical penetration appears in the judgment of characters and events in general. Even after the success of the revolution the diary continues to be filled with the unimportant goings and comings of members of the royal family, while the names of Kerensky and Lenin occur infrequently and only when there is a chance to cast a slur upon them. Kerensky is endowed with Jewish antecedents in order to increase the horror at his residing in the Winter Palace, and the writer has no hesitation in convicting him of treachery toward Korniloff, whose failure to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

restore the Empire he feelingly laments; Lenin, of course, is simply the German agent. It would seem impossible for a man living from 1915 to October, 1917, in the center of Petrograd to know less of what was going on, to show less judgment in discriminating facts from casual hearsay, and to have a feebler comprehension of what was significant. If England relied on men like this to keep her in touch with the heart of Russian affairs, then the ineptitude shown in her diplomatic relations with that country is easily accounted for.

THE changes in industry in recent years have been so numerous that Daniel Bloomfield in "Modern Industrial Movements" (Wilson) renders a real service in bringing together in one volume important printed material which has appeared in periodicals, reports, and other important sources not easily accessible. Such subjects as coöperation, syndicalism, industrial unionism, the Industrial Workers of the World, shop stewards, scientific management, guild socialism, management sharing, Bolshevism, labor parties, and industrial reconstruction programs are presented in articles written each by an authority. The aim evidently has been to present every subject from all angles so that the reader may have the opportunity of forming his own judgment as to the particular movements in which he is interested. The section on scientific management, for instance, includes five articles by such authorities as Swift T. Farnham, Louis D. Brandeis, H. S. Person, C. B. Thompson, and J. P. Frey. Thus we have the opinions of two consulting engineers, a representative of the Taylor Society, a lawyer, and a representative of organized labor. The shop stewards movement in England is likewise brought out very clearly. Management-sharing, one of the most recent of industrial movements, is explained and illustrated by both American and English writers. The selection on the whole is a fair and representative one. There is an exceptionally complete bibliography.

Drama

Jangled Lives

AS its fourth subscription performance of the season the Theater Guild presented Strindberg's "The Dance of Death." The production had the two notes of faithfulness to fact and density of moral atmosphere which mark Mr. Reicher's work. The hexagonal tower-room designed by Mr. Lee Simonson for the first part of the play combined clearness and freedom with a somber and menacing beauty. The players were sincere and created occasional moments of unaffected eloquence; it is doubtful whether they had quite penetrated to the inner substance of the play. Mr. Albert Perry displayed an extraordinary virtuosity without an inner assumption of the character he portrayed. Mr. Dudley Digges, one of the best actors on our stage, is too home-spun and forthright for Strindberg. Miss Helen Westley alone conveyed the sense of a vivid experience and of having projected into the play not only skill but a soul that can be troubled. Despite its comparative inadequacy, the production brings to an honorable close the second season of the only American theater of which we can be wholly proud.

What a play! Written in 1901 it leaps beyond its year and ours and establishes the dramaturgy of the future. Its method is as astonishing as it is simple. It deals with people, not with moral attributes. It does not let an abstract quality overshadow a man. Strindberg clove to the root of the ancient fallacy in the Horatian council to "let Medea be fierce, Ino tearful, Ixion perfidious, and Orestes sad." For the result of such characterization is to give us Ferocity, Perfidy, Sadness. What was Othello's occupation during the period covered by the play when he was not jealous? Did Alceste consider the question of social probity at breakfast? The drama is full of "humours" and

ALFRED · A · KNOPF BORZOI BOOKS 220 W. 42 Street, NEW YORK

This Simian World

Suppose another species of animals had had all of Man's advantages, and had, instead of him, become the dominant race. Would the world that the elephants or the ants, let us say, would have built have been greatly different from ours? Mr. Day thinks the comparison a useful one so far as man is concerned and it points conclusively to the origin in our brute ancestors, of many otherwise puzzling traits of the Human. An entertaining volume, amusingly illustrated in pen-and-ink by the author. ($1.50 *net.*)

How the War Came

Those who believe that the work of peacemaking was complete at Versailles will have no use for Earl Loreburn's book, for the lesson it teaches—that the war was the result of the blundering work of secret diplomacy—is as applicable now as in 1914 or before. It remains today the outstanding "confession" of any of the men who conducted the negotiations up to August, 1914. Particularly noteworthy are the chapters entitled "Was It Inevitable?" and "Remedies." ($3.00 *net.*)

Two Women—

as far apart as the antipodes—both very remarkable—vastly different in every characteristic—are in turn the attracters of a man, RICHARD KURT, the first novel by a coming writer, Stephen Hudson. The man does not change, and he is not weak. The explanation of the phenomenon is a distinctly unusual psychological attempt. The background of the story is a section of a decadent European society. ($2.25 *net.*)

Witter Bynner

—"the ablest handler of pure English among American poets and the one most surely visited by pure inspiration" (*New York Tribune*)—presents his best recent work, lyrics and free verse, long and short poems, in A CANTICLE OF PAN. The vein is distinctly that rich one which he employed in his early verse, like the *Ode to Harvard*, rather than that of the *Spectra* episode. Especially noteworthy are the Canticles, cast in a striking new verse form. (*Just published;* $2.00 *net.*)

Dorothy Richardson's "Interim"

is the latest volume of the interesting *Pilgrimage* series, of which H. G. Wells, May Sinclair, and J. D. Beresford (among others, of course) confess themselves devoted readers and admirers. This volume continues the story of Miriam Henderson's life; it introduces Mr. Mendizabel and many other new and curious characters. ($2.00 *net.*)

THE FREE LANCE BOOKS

Edited with Introductions by H. L. Mencken
$1.75 net each

I. Youth and Egolatry *By Pio Baroja*
Baroja, recognized by those who really know as the greatest of contemporary Spanish novelists, has probably the keenest pen and shrewdest wit behind it of any Continental author now writing. This volume is a remarkable body of original and stimulating doctrine.

II. Ventures in Common Sense *By E. W. Howe*
"People who imagine that the American character has changed radically in the past hundred years would do well to compare these maxims with Ben Franklin's. There are significant differences, but the woof of homespun is astonishingly the same."—*The Freeman.*

III. The Antichrist *By F. W. Nietzsche*
Translated by H. L. Mencken
A new translation with an attempt to reflect in English the extraordinary pungent and dramatic style of the original. It is the most devastating criticism of revealed religion ever written.

IV. We Moderns *By Edwin Muir*
An original and penetrating criticism of the modern spirit, particularly as it is revealed in the sciences and the fine arts. It has already attracted remarkably favorable notice from some of our best critics.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"ruling passions." Rarely until very late does it present men and women. The reply that a dramatic action demands a concentration and an overemphatic treatment of its motives only restates the old fallacy in another form. The psychologist tells us for convenience about abstract memory or imagination. In reality there are no such things. There are indeed, in the thumping Stevensonian phrase, "passionate crises of existence." But they hardly arise when "duty and inclination come nobly to the grapple." Who knows his inclination? Will it be exactly the same if it rains tomorrow? Suppose she wears her hair differently in the morning, or there is a slump in the market, or one wakes with an attack of influenza? These noble and naked absolutes grimly face to face were all very well when your heroes were kings or generals making grandiose and probably vicious decisions at the risk of some one else's skin. And duty? Shall I do my duty—the thing prescribed from without by social compacts and moral traditions, or shall I do *my* duty, a thing so difficult and fragile and much to be desired? Can either be disengaged clearly enough at a given moment to justify the eruptive gesture of the dramaturgic tradition?

The Captain and his wife in "The Dance of Death" have seen each other so long and so closely that they no longer see each other at all. They try, like all people, to find moral tags in the name of which they can justify their mutual hatred. It is a profoundly true circumstance that Alice does this more continually than her husband, who yields quite unreflectively to his vindictive impulses. The woman is more passionate, yet more desirous of justifying her hatred. Hence she is eager to prove in him the qualities that explain it. She has, no doubt, chances enough. Again and again she convinces her friend and kinsman Curt. But in the end all hatred breaks down because all isolation of moral qualities becomes impossible. We know least those whom we know best, because we see them no longer analytically but concretely. We have no clues, because every clue becomes coarse and misleading when brought to the test of a reality so intricate and obscure. This husband and this wife feign, at times with passion and terror, to despise and hate each other. Yet they are unable to break their galling chains because, having passed beyond the perception of mere evil qualities in each other and seeing each other as concrete psychical organisms, they cannot hold either contempt or hatred long enough. They shift and waver and know too much to rise to the point of willing and they die in the inextricable bonds in which they are caught.

"There are disharmonies in life," Strindberg lets Gustav say in "Creditors," "that cannot be resolved." The tragic outcome is that there is no tragic outcome. There is no liberating action and no appeasement of the heart. The years drag on and the shadows lengthen and then comes the dance of death. Children grow up and fall into the same entanglements and almost at once the familiar disharmonies begin to sound—as Alice hears them from Judith and Alan and the lieutenant. But the will to live and continue the race gilds all beginnings with romance, and the Captain and his wife in the tower-room are neither an example nor a warning. Nor is it only the young whom instinct robs of vision. Alice has but to make the immemorial gesture and Curt, the clear-minded and the disillusioned, is in flames.

Yet from this very play there arises a hope beyond the note of compassion with which, contrary to the custom of his more acrid years, Strindberg ends his action. It is no accident that the Captain and Alice live on an island. Most married couples do. They have the same friends and see the same scenes. People and the very trees and streets take on the blurred colors of that tense and monotonous and islanded existence. They cling to each other and restrict each other and seek to enforce agreements and concessions and harmonies of which the very nature must be the spontaneity of perfect freedom. They assume possession and practice force, and the island becomes a prison. The Captain and Alice stayed on the island as each other's keepers. Thus each became at once a tyrant and a slave. If only they had tried a little wandering and used their island as a place of peace and refuge, and renounced possession as the one hope of coming into their own at last! No, the disharmonies cannot be resolved. But they can be silenced. Where the hope of a rare and difficult happiness ends, peace and freedom may begin.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

Where Your Money Goes
See *The Nation* of June 12th

FRANK HARRIS
will speak Wednesday, June 2d, at 8.30 P. M.
on KEATS, JOHN DAVIDSON and SWINBURNE
(*The Poets of Passion*)
and on Sunday, June 6th, at 8.30 P. M.
CARLYLE, ECCLESIASTES and EMERSON
(*Further Secrets of Carlyle*)
at FRANK HARRIS Studio, 57 Fifth Avenue *Admission $1.00*

FILMS FOR LABOR
A company organized to produce films in the interests of labor, social and cultural advancement seeks the financial co-operation of liberals able to invest from $50 to $1,000 in a project designed to give a fair return on the investment besides promoting and achieving a great ideal in behalf of humanity.
Those who are interested will kindly communicate with the
LABOR FILM SERVICE, Inc.
31 Union Square *Dept. B.* New York City

Napoleon
A Play
By HERBERT TRENCH
Net $2.00
"One of the surprising events of the English dramatic year has been Mr. Trench's play 'Napoleon.' Like Mr. Drinkwater's 'Abraham Lincoln,' it has been successfully performed as well as read, and emerging from the propaganda drama of the Shavian School it becomes a work of art and characterization, of spirit and passion."

A Day-Book of Walter Savage Landor
Chosen by JOHN BAILEY
Net $1.25
"Landor's main topics were two, books and liberty: the liberty to seek truth and follow goodness . . . where he excels all but the very greatest in the world is in the intensity of his best thought and the astonishing perfection of its utterance. He transports us into a state in which thought and wonder and delight are a single fusion of our being."
At all booksellers or from the publishers
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
American Branch
35 West 32nd Street
New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Contents

AMBASSADOR FRANCIS AND COMMISSAR CHICHERIN 776
AN APPEAL FROM RUSSIAN INTELLECTUALS..... 781
TO THE YOUNG SOLDIERS OF FRANCE..... 781

Ambassador Francis and Commissar Chicherin

THE correspondence reprinted below between the American Embassy at Vologda and the Russian Soviet Government, relative to the residence at Vologda in 1918 of Ambassador Francis and his staff, is taken from an official pamphlet published in 1919 by the Russian Peoples Commissariat for Foreign Affairs.

10/7/18. TELEGRAM *Urgent*

AMERICAN AMBASSADOR FRANCIS,
VOLOGDA.

Taking in consideration present situation and possibility of danger for representatives of Entente Powers Soviet Government looks upon Moscow as town where security of named representatives can be assured. Considering as its duty safeguarding ambassadors' security Government sees in their coming to Moscow a question of necessity. We hope that highly esteemed American Ambassador will appreciate this step in friendly spirit in which it is undertaken. In order to execute this measure and to remove any difficulties Peoples Commissariat for Foreign Affairs delegates to Vologda as its representative citizen Radek.

CHICHERIN (602)

10/7/18. TELEGRAM

CHICHERIN, COMMISSARIAT FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
MOSCOW.

July 11. Immediately on receiving your urgent message last midnight I called a meeting of the chiefs of the Allied missions as their dean. I am requested by them to ask you why you think our remaining in Vologda unsafe or inadvisable. We have no fear of the Russian people whom we have always befriended and whom we consider our allies and we have full confidence in the population of Vologda. Our only anxiety is concerning the forces of the Central Empires with whom we are at war, and in our judgment they are much more likely to capture Moscow than Vologda. We realize that in a country suffering as Russia is at present there are unreasonable and desperate men, but we are confident that they are not more dangerous at Vologda than elsewhere. At Moscow on the other hand we hear that the Germans have already received permission to introduce their troops to safeguard their representatives, and in any case the town is directly threatened by the Germans. If you mean by your message that the Government of Soviets have taken without consulting the Allied missions the decision that the latter should come to Moscow and that you are sending Mr. Radek to carry such a decision into execution we desire to inform you that we consider that would be offensive to us and we would not comply therewith. FRANCIS

12/7/18. TELEGRAM *Urgent*

AMBASSADOR FRANCIS,
VOLOGDA.

Thanks for telegram. You are obviously badly informed; it is absolutely false that Germans have received permission to introduce troops Moscow, this monstrous distortion of true situation shows that somebody from Moscow deliberately misrepresents to you our policy and real state of things. When you will be in Moscow no intriguers will be able to create such trouble between us. Moscow is not threatened by Germans, if it was the case we would at once warn you and take steps necessary for your departure. You are insufficiently informed situation Russia, people are for us but conspiring groups like that which acted lately systematically create trouble; such conspirators prepare stroke. Your remaining Vologda impossible. We have responsibility to bear, we cannot otherwise. Radek goes consult you first.

CHICHERIN

LETTER (TRANSLATED)

VOLOGDA, July 14, 1918

THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR, DEAN OF THE DIPLOMATIC CORPS,
VOLOGDA.

On July 12 I beg to inform you that the People's Commissary for Foreign Affairs deems it necessary for the entire diplomatic corps to leave Vologda for Moscow. I was pointing out to you that our invitation was due to the apprehension that the adventurous elements which attempted to involve Russia in the war through the provocative assassination of the German Ambassador might try to protect themselves against the accusation of acting as the result of Allied inducement by making a similar attempt against the representatives of the Allied Powers. At the same time I was emphasizing the fact to which my attention was drawn by the Soviet authorities at Vologda that about 5,000 German and Austrian prisoners of war have gathered there and are no doubt partially excited by the assassination of the German Ambassador.

I took the liberty of responding to all your objections advanced in your name and in that of the diplomatic corps. I pointed out that the information supplied to you by persons personally unknown to me about German military detachments being at present in Moscow is a conscious provocation. With regard to your statement that Moscow is directly threatened by a German offensive I submitted that this having actually been the case with Petrograd all measures were at that time taken by us for assisting the diplomatic representatives as well as a great number of allied citizens who were demanding to be evacuated; and this we did before we evacuated our own Government.

I regret to have to note that these arguments did not convince the diplomatic corps at Vologda. You replied that until you would receive information as to what demands the Germans have made in connection with the assassination of Count Mirbach, you would not be in position to alter your decision about refusing to go to Moscow.

Hereby I beg to inform you in the name of the Peoples Commissariat for Foreign Affairs that the German Government in connection with the assassination of Count Mirbach has only made the self-evident demand for the punishment of the persons guilty of the assassination and for the reinforcement of our guards at the Embassy.

In fulfilling your request for information concerning the demand of the German Government, I insist most emphatically on the fulfilment of our request for the departure of the diplomatic corps to Moscow. I emphasize once more that our proposal does not emanate out of any other motives but our solicitude for the safety of the diplomatic representatives.

I also emphasize once more that we shall contemplate a non-fulfilment of our request as an act distinctly unfriendly and hostile.

I beg to ask you for the earliest possible reply.

KARL RADEK,
Representative of the Peoples Commissariat for Foreign Affairs.

LETTER

VOLOGDA, July 15, 1918.

MR. K. RADEK, Representative of the Peoples Commissariat for Foreign Affairs,
HOTEL GOLDEN ANCHOR, VOLOGDA.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 14th addressed to myself

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as dean of the diplomatic corps in Vologda, I inclose copies of telegraphic correspondence between Mr. Commissary Chicherin and myself. This correspondence was begun before your arrival in Vologda and we think presents sufficient answer to the letter above mentioned. Sincerely,

DAVID R. FRANCIS

LETTER

VOLOGDA, July 15, 1918.

MR. K. RADEK, Representative of the Peoples Commissariat for Foreign Affairs,
HOTEL GOLDEN ANCHOR, VOLOGDA.

SIR: Both your communications of this date were received after the adjournment of the meeting of the Allied chiefs in Vologda which was of a duration of nearly two hours. The reply agreed upon and sent to the Commissary in response to his cordial message of the 14th I thought was inclosed to you in my letter of today, but I find it was not. The inclosures were incomplete without it. I forward herewith a copy of my telegram to the Commissariat of this date which contains the reply to the invitation as agreed upon unanimously by the diplomatic corps in Vologda and regret that it was not inclosed in my previous note of this date. Sincerely,

DAVID R. FRANCIS

LETTER (TRANSLATED)

VOLOGDA, July 15, 1918

THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR, Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, VOLOGDA.

I received from you copies of the telegrams exchanged between you and the Peoples Commissary Chicherin of which I was already informed heretofore. I regret to have to note that these telegrams do not contain any answer to my inquiry nor a realization of the promise given to me on the 12th instant. You promised to submit to a new decision the question of your going to Moscow as soon as you will be in receipt of information about German demands raised in connection with the assassination of Count Mirbach. You have received this information from me and I am therefore constrained to ask you by the present [*sic*] to fulfil the promise given me by you on July 12 to convoke the diplomatic corps and to reply to me in its name whether you are willing or not to respond to the invitation of the Russian Government.

I should be much obliged to you if I shall receive an answer even today.

KARL RADEK,
Representative of the Peoples Commissariat for Foreign Affairs.

LETTER (TRANSLATED)

VOLOGDA, July 15, 1918

THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR, Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, VOLOGDA.

On July 14 I received the following telegram from Chicherin, Peoples Commissary for Foreign Affairs, which I beg to bring to your cognizance:

"Answering the inquiry of the American Ambassador I pointed out to him, and ask you to do it, that the measures taken by you, such as the stationing of guards, do not propose to limit the immunity of the diplomatic corps, but are on the contrary safeguarding their safety. As a matter of fact the White Guard bands are erring [*sic*] across northern Russia making unexpectedly their appearance at different places. Moreover the danger of a Left Social Revolutionist provocative maneuver has to be taken into account. In our possession there are direct indications concerning the preparation of an attempt from their quarter to be made in Vologda. There is also an accumulation of German prisoners of war in Vologda.

When I was writing about the impossibility of the ambassadors remaining at Vologda, I had in mind the actual impossibility resulting from the state of affairs in this place and which is outside the reach of our control. The English offensive against Soroki, towards Sumski Possad, i. e., eastward in the direction of Onega, which has no relation whatsoever to the danger threatening from the direction of Finland, and the fusillades of members of the Kem Soviet are causing such excitement in the broad popular masses that sudden outbreaks against the English are possible, and every day of unnecessary sojourn of the ambassadors in Vologda is pregnant with the possibility of a catastrophe which we cannot quietly envisage and are obliged to avert.

"If for some reason or other Moscow is not to the liking of the ambassadors we can offer them near Moscow beautiful and convenient villas. I applied in my first telegram a more determined tone for the reason that Mr. Francis told Vosnesensky that they are not going to Moscow in order that it might not be understood as a change of policy on their part which actually did not take place. Taking into consideration this statement of Mr. Francis I pointed out the actual impossibility which stands outside the reach of our control of their remaining at Vologda as thereby the possibility is eliminated of their leaving for Moscow being interpreted as a change of policy of the Allies. I would ask you to continue explaining to the ambassadors this our view emphasizing at the same time that our actions do not purpose to insult the dignity of the nations represented by the diplomatic corps but present merely the fulfilment of the duty devolving upon us of averting the dangers threatening the diplomatic corps."

KARL RADEK,
Representative of the Peoples Commissariat for Foreign Affairs.

TELEGRAM (TRANSLATED)

15th July, 1918. *Urgent*

RADEK, VOLOGDA SOVIET.

Owing to unexpected complications it is necessary to delay the decision, await our further instructions 620.

CHICHERIN

13/7/18. TELEGRAM

CHICHERIN, COMMISSARIAT FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS, MOSCOW.

I have received your telegram in response to mine which was sent in reply to your first telegram concerning the removal of the Allied mission from Vologda to Moscow. Mr. Radek, representative of the Soviet Government, arrived and had conference with me before the receipt of this telegram. He informed me that your first telegram was intended for invitation or advice to the Allied missions in Vologda and not a command or a decision to be enforced by him as your representative. After conferring with Mr. Radek I submitted his proposition to the Allied diplomatic corps which decided to stand on its former reply and declined your invitation to come to Moscow until hearing what further demands or movements Germany is likely to make as the German press and many prominent Germans charge the Allies with inspiring, planning, and carrying into execution the assassination of the German Ambassador Mirbach. Mr. Radek when informed by me of this decision demanded a written statement from the Allied missions that we absolve the Soviet Government from all responsibility for our safety. When again informed that the Allied missions stand on their reply telegraphed you until they learn what Germany demands or proposes to do, Mr. Radek stated that he would station guards around every Allied chancery or residence in Vologda who would be instructed to admit no one without his approval or ours as he proposed to remain in Vologda until receiving further instructions from you or the Soviet Government. While we have not asked for guards and appreciate guards stationed around our residences and chanceries solely for our protection we look upon the plan as proposed by Mr. Radek as a virtual arrangement to place us under espionage or to make us prisoners. We trust such is not your intention; if it is we protest

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the plan proposed by Mr. Radek as incompatible with the dignity of our governments. Your telegram states that our remaining in Vologda is "impossible." While Mr. Radek disclaimed any intention on the part of the Soviet Government to compel us to come to Moscow your telegram fails to reply to that portion of my message to you based upon the theory that Mr. Radek had been sent to Vologda to carry into execution a decision of the Soviet Government. We await your reply to this telegram.

FRANCIS

14/7/18. TELEGRAM *Urgent*

AMERICAN AMBASSADOR FRANCIS,

VOLOGDA.

Answering your telegram dated 13th July, I can state guards stationed around your chanceries and residences have sole aim your protection against dangers menacing you in the present situation about which we have information. We are very far from attempting anything incompatible with our duties towards you, but it is this duty that compels us not to allow catastrophic events to happen. We never intended to command you, and Mr. Radek did not go with that purpose; my first telegram was intended for invitation and we were ourselves and are still compelled by the real state of things existing in fact, independently from our will, to draw your attention to the "impossibility" existing in fact not through us of your remaining in Vologda under the conditions about which we have information. Germany makes no further demands except those communicated to you by Radek. If Moscow is displeasing to you we can offer for your residence beautiful villas in its neighborhood.

CHICHERIN

15/7/18. TELEGRAM

CHICHERIN, COMMISSARIAT FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

MOSCOW.

July 15. Your message dated 14th received about midnight and we thank you for its cordiality and for the interest you manifest in our personal safety. We accept your assurance that the guards stationed around our chanceries and residences have as their "sole aim" our "protection against dangers menacing us in the present situation about which you have information." As, however, our wishes were not consulted when the guards were sent, and as Mr. Radek stated when informing me such guards would be established that no one would be permitted to enter our chanceries or residences without permission from the Soviet authorities we quite naturally concluded that we were placed under espionage if not made prisoners. The guards were not sent until the following day when we received official notice from the Vologda Extraordinary Revolutionary Staff that persons designated by Allied missions would also be allowed entrance thereto. While repeating that it is impossible for us to remain in Vologda where quiet and order still prevail you do not mention the nature of the danger which is so imminent. We repeat that we have no fear of injury from the Russian people themselves whom we have continuously befriended, whom we still consider our allies, and for whom we are making strenuous efforts to import food from our own countries. We are in Vologda with the approval or by the instruction of our respective governments and feel that we should not change our residence without consulting them. You are doubtless aware that cable communication with our governments has been severed and contrary to all international courtesies and rights is no longer permitted. None of us have received a communication from our governments since the assassination of the German Ambassador Mirbach with which the Allies are absurdly charged by the German press and by many German leaders. We submit that no reply to your courteous invitation should be demanded of us before communication with our governments is reestablished in order that we may inform them of this invitation and receive instructions thereon or authority to act on our own judgment. Your telegram states "Germany makes no further demands except those communicated to you by Radek"; we believe that the demands already put forward are not final. Since those terms were communicated to you through your representative in Berlin there has been a change in the ministry of the German Government, who may be expected to demand concessions additional to those communicated to us by Mr. Radek. If you will arrange so that we can communicate with our respective governments, sufficient time may elapse to enable both you and ourselves to ascertain what additional or different demands the new German ministry may make upon the Soviet Government or what new charges it may present against the Allies.

FRANCIS

17/7/18. TELEGRAM

AMBASSADOR FRANCIS,

VOLOGDA.

Thanking you very much for your kind telegram I allow myself to refer you to our representative Radek about the questions you mentioned. We have had new trouble but now it is all right.

CHICHERIN (625)

22/7/18. TELEGRAM *Urgent*

AMERICAN AMBASSADOR FRANCIS,

VOLOGDA.

I entreat you most earnestly leave Vologda, come here; danger approaches, tomorrow can be too late; when battle rages distinction of houses cannot be made. If all smashed in your domiciles during struggle of contending forces responsibility will fall upon your making deaf ear to all entreaties. Why bring about catastrophe which we will avert?

CHICHERIN (660)

LETTER (TRANSLATED)

VOLOGDA, July 17, 1918

TO THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR, Dean of the Diplomatic Corps,

VOLOGDA.

SIR: In view of the fact that I have received an urgent call to go to Moscow and am leaving at 4 p. m. today I desire to have the honor of taking leave of you individually. I regret to be constrained to abandon the pleasure to present to you personally before my departure the sentiments of profound respect towards you and the nation represented by you, as you would only be in a position (as your Secretary informed me by telephone) to receive me later on. I beg to do it in writing.

Concerning the matter which constituted the purpose of my going to Vologda, the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs will communicate with you by wire and I wish to express the hope that in the near future we shall have the pleasure of welcoming you and the entire diplomatic corps in the capital of the workmen's and peasants' Soviet Republic.

Precise instructions have been issued by me to the local authorities for the defence of your immunity inasmuch as it can be safeguarded in a small town. These instructions have the following purport:

The guards will be bound to keep close watch over the persons passing by the embassies. The Provincial Executive Committee will issue to the members of the embassies diplomatic certificates. Your Russian employees and tradesmen will be supplied by the local authorities with passes into the embassies in accordance with your certificates; same applies to Russian citizens who will be distiguished by your invitations to the embassies. They will be supplied by the Executive Committee with passes for a certain period of time at every notice of yours.

The Extraordinary Commission for fighting the [illegible] Revolution established in Vologda will supervise the pro[illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of your immunity. We experience acute regret owing to the fact that your idyllic sojourn in Vologda must be superseded by a more standardized mode of living, but the war has created the necessity of such standardization in your countries as well. As to us in Russia, we are in a state of perpetual war upon all fronts.

Your communications with your governments have been interrupted by the British landing in Murman. We shall endeavor to reestablish them through the Moscow wireless station. I would ask you to address all your telegrams to your representative in Moscow, from whom we shall receive them for further transmission by wireless.

Accept, sir, once more the expression of my profound esteem towards you and the diplomatic corps headed by you.

K. RADEK,
Representative of the Peoples Commissariat for Foreign Affairs.

23/7/18. TELEGRAM
COMMISSAR FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
MOSCOW.

Thanks for your telegram; we appreciate your continued interest in our personal safety and have concluded to follow your advice and leave Vologda.

FRANCIS

24/7/18. TELEGRAM
AMERICAN AMBASSADOR FRANCIS,
VOLOGDA.

Having heard of your resolve to leave Vologda for Archangel, we see ourselves compelled, whilst appreciating your clear comprehension of the untenable situation in Vologda, to beg to be kindly informed by you about some particulars of your decision. If your intention is to leave Russia we are powerless to hinder you in doing so, but we express our sincerest regrets at your departure from our soil, together with our hope to see you soon in our midst here in the heart of Soviet Russia. In case you really wish to depart we beg to emphasize that in our view the relations between our two countries are not going to be affected by an event to which we will not ascribe any political symptomatic character. If, however, the idea of exchanging Vologda for Archangel was not altogether removed from your mind it is unfortunately necessary to draw your attention to the fact that under military rule in the expectation of a siege Archangel cannot be a residence fit for ambassadors and that such a question cannot possibly be answered in the affirmative. I cannot but repeat that under the present conditions, when our foes, seeing their impotence to take our place in the political inclinations of the great masses, seek to conspire, to create artificial outbursts, and to provoke civil war, we can with complete earnestness point to Moscow, where, as experience shows, our forces are and cannot but remain in undisturbed control of the city, and to its peaceful gay suburbs with their splendid villas as to an appropriate abode which our Government deliberately proposes to the Ambassador of friendly America. We must at any cost avoid the danger of your departure being misinterpreted in the eyes of our great masses and of American public opinion and of its being understood in a sense altogether dissimilar to that in which you and myself would understand it, which at the present juncture would be a fatal mistake, and the best means of averting this danger would be your coming to the official center of Russia, where a warm reception awaits you. The special train is at your disposal, but we do not lose the hope that your decision will be to come to Moscow.

CHICHERIN

24/7/18. TELEGRAM
"...CHERIN, Commissar Foreign Affairs,
...COW.

...ceipt of your urgent telegram of the twenty-second addressed to me as dean of the diplomatic corps and received about noon of the twenty-third, I called the diplomatic corps in conference. After deliberating, we decided to leave Vologda, but considered that our previous telegraphic correspondence had fully settled the question of our going to Moscow, and that conclusion was negative. As dean of the corps I replied to your telegram expressing appreciation for your continued interest in our personal safety and advising that we had concluded to leave Vologda. Consequently the entire diplomatic corps repaired to their trains at Vologda station, but on giving directions for the train to move we were informed by the railroad officials that no motive power could be furnished without authority from Moscow. We were under the impression and had been informed from reliable source that these trains were at our disposal and locomotives would be furnished upon our request. When such request was forwarded to Moscow the reply was received after some delay that locomotives could not be furnished without your consent, and you desired to know who had asked for the train for the American Ambassador and for what purpose he wished to go to Archangel. I promptly directed that reply be made that the locomotive was desired to take the entire diplomatic corps to Archangel, as they had concluded to quit Vologda upon receipt of your urgent telegram entreating them to leave because unsafe to remain in Vologda and stating that postponing departure until tomorrow might be too late. In reply to this statement you wired me at length. The correspondence up to this time had been between myself as dean of the diplomatic corps and yourself as Commissar of Foreign Affairs. This telegram, while sent to me as dean of the diplomatic corps, is meant also for me as the American Ambassador. Permit me to say that while your message is appreciated because expressing friendly feeling for the people I represent and desire on your part to maintain relations with them and with our government, your treatment of me as their representative does not concord with such expressions. While I refrained from interfering in the internal affairs of Russia, I have considered that the Russian people were still our allies and have more than once appealed to them to unite with us in resisting a common enemy. I have furthermore recommended to my Government many times to send food to relieve the sufferings of the Russian people and to ship agricultural implements to meet requirements of Russia. A wireless message sent from Washington July 18, received at Moscow, was delivered to me after last midnight; it stated that no message had been received from me of later date than June 24, except one sent through Archangel July 7 speaking of the killing of the German Ambassador; it furthermore stated that it had cabled me often and fully. I have received no cable from my Government that was sent after July 3 except two wireless messages inquiring why they did not hear from me; I have cabled fully every day. Moreover, the press of Vologda and doubtless the entire press of Russia has received order to print nothing from any Allied ambassador or representative without first submitting same to the Soviet Government; some journals in Vologda and some in Petrograd did print your first telegram inviting or ordering the diplomatic corps to come to Moscow and our reply thereto; these were given to the press by myself for the information of the Russian people and because I thought that secret diplomacy had been abolished in Russia. Upon hearing that the press was forbidden to publish further correspondence concerning our removal to Moscow the diplomatic corps decided to have printed in pamphlet form in Russian the entire correspondence on the subject, together with some excerpts from a stenographic report of the interview issued with your representative Radek and myself. These pamphlets have been ready for delivery for two days past, but we are informed that the Central Soviet Committee or the Extraordinary Revolutionary Staff of Vologda has prohibited delivery of same to us. Your last telegram addressed to myself, while expressing friendly sentiments towards America and consideration for its ambassador, makes no mention of my colleagues representing America's allies in Vologda. This is to inform you if you en-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NY6 20

tertain any doubts on the subject that the Allied representatives in Vologda are acting in concert and in perfect harmony. The Allied missions and staffs have been living for twenty-four hours in the special train on track at Vologda station awaiting a locomotive to transport them to Archangel. Your telegram to me states that if you permitted [them] to go to Archangel it would only be for the purpose of their leaving Russia which you "are powerless to hinder." Your telegram states that Archangel is not a fit residence for Ambassadors in the event of "a siege." Do you expect a German siege of Archangel? You certainly do not anticipate Allied siege of that city or you would not insist upon the Allied representatives coming to Moscow. If you mean a siege of Archangel by Russians I can only repeat what I have said to you and to the Russian people many times, and that is that the Allies have nothing to fear from the Russian people whom they have constantly befriended and with whom they consider themselves still in alliance against a common enemy. Speaking for myself, I have no desire nor intention of leaving Russia unless forced to do so, and in such event my absence would be temporary. . . . The Allied diplomatic corps awaits your immediate approval of the locomotive to draw their train to Archangel. If local authorities at Archangel consider the situation does not allow us to remain, we shall leave with deep regret and with hope of soon returning.

FRANCIS

24/7/18. TELEGRAM

MR. CHICHERIN, Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Moscow.

I am instructed by the dean of the diplomatic corps to inform you that the diplomats of the Allied mission at Vologda after consideration of your message decided to request you to furnish at your earliest convenience a locomotive to draw their special train from Vologda to Archangel.

LEHRS

24/7/1919. TELEGRAM (TRANSLATED)

MR. LEHRS, United States Vice-Consul.

Owing to technical difficulties of transmitting my answer in English, I am going to write it in Russian, and would ask you to translate it into English, as my relations with Mr. Poole have shown me the accuracy of your translation. The absolute separation from America and even from England is placing us in a difficult position.

We were deprived of facilities of transmitting telegrams through Murmansk. It is only quite recently that the Archangel telegraph station succeeded in establishing for a short time the connection with the Murmansk station, this having been accompanied by considerable difficulties, while now we have again been deprived of these facilities according to the statement received from Murman. An agreement about using the Finnish cable has not been yet entered into. Our only means of communicating with England is through wireless, while with America we are only in a position to communicate to the extent as the wireless messages are transmitted there from England or from France. The Moscow wireless station has no connection with England, a connection with Paris and Lyons can only be established under considerable difficulties, the connection only lasting a short time. Atmospheric conditions do not admit the use of this connection every day; the messages have to be repeated several times until they are received. Nevertheless we are using this extremely difficult way for transmitting American, English, and French telegrams, though practically it is only possible to a limited extent. If Mr. Francis were to send us his telegrams, we would, within the limits stated above, send them in the same way as we are sending, though unfortunately sometimes with unavoidable delays, the telegrams of Mr. Poole. Whether or not the wireless messages received in Paris and Lyons are being sent on is beyond our control. Only the other day the Tsarskoye Selo wireless station succeeded in establishing connection with England. The United States Ambassador is experiencing the same difficulties of communication as we are ourselves. As regards the publication of the booklet, we will inquire into the matter. The Moscow press has not been placed under any restrictions concerning the publication of the Ambassador's statements, neither have such general prohibitions been issued. However, as regards the statements concerning the happenings in Vologda or in Petrograd, I must first make inquiries in order to avoid misunderstandings. At the moment when I sent my yesterday's telegram to Mr. Francis I knew only of his desire to leave for Archangel, and I learned this from the railway authorities, wherefore my telegram was addressed to him only in his capacity as American Ambassador and not as dean of the diplomatic corps. About other ambassadors intending to leave, I learned later on, while the telegram of Mr. Francis was received by me today only. Considering the impossibility of the ambassadors staying either in Vologda or in Archangel, their decision to leave for Archangel is tantamount to departure from Russia. The British Army from the railway station Soroki is advancing eastwards, and at the White Sea coast English reconnoitrances [*sic*] have been captured with a map of the environs. Considering these military actions as result of the British Government being inadequately informed owing to numerous counter revolutionaries, enemies of the Russian people, staying in London and furnishing false information to the British influential circles, we protest against the British invasion and send troops to counteract the British armed invasion of our boundaries without up to the present moment breaking off diplomatic relations, but we are bound to point out that the fusillades of Soviet members, wholesale arrests, and other counter revolutionary acts of British occupationary authorities have called forth among the broad masses of the people a wave of indignation and resentment the consequences of which cannot be foreseen. We should profoundly regret if Mr. Francis and other ambassadors have decided to leave for Archangel, i. e., in fact, to leave Russia, and we equally hope for their early return to Russia and therewith to Moscow, the residence of the Soviet Government. The refusal to go to Moscow leaves to Mr. Francis under the present circumstances (we note this with profound regret) no other way out. This being the case there only remains to issue orders for a locomotive to be placed at his disposal at Vologda and a steamer to be prepared in Archangel. Will you be kind enough to remit to Mr. Francis the assurances of my profound esteem and the hope of obtaining the possibility of sustaining with him in the near future close and friendly relations under more normal conditions. I also hope to have soon the pleasure of seeing you, Mr. Lehrs, once more in Moscow.

CHICHERIN

TELEGRAM (TRANSLATED)

July 24, 1918

MR. LEHRS, American Vice-Consul.

Shall issue instructions for locomotive being placed at your disposal at Vologda and for steamship being prepared for you at Archangel. We emphasize once more that we do not attach political importance to this individual departure of diplomatic representatives caused by a maladvertent concurrence of circumstances without our control, which we profoundly regret.

CHICHERIN

28/VII/1918. TELEGRAM.

AMERICAN AMBASSADOR FRANCIS, ARCHANGEL.

I take the opportunity of this last moment before your departure to express once more my profound regret and sorrow at the unfortunate circumstances that have had as result your present journey across the sea and also my best thanks for your kindness and courtesy and for your good feelings towards the Russian popular masses whose most adequate and faithful representatives are the Soviets, the councils of the poor and of the toiling. Please convey our affection and admiration in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

messages you will send across the ocean to the great people of pioneers on the new continent and to the posterity of Cromwell's revolutionaries and of the heroes of the War of Independence.

CHICHERIN

An Appeal from Russian Intellectuals

THE London *Nation* for May 1, 1920, printed the following appeal from Russian intellectuals, signed by university professors, business men, lawyers, engineers, literary men, an ex-Under-Secretary of State, and an ex-Director of the Société de Crédit at Petrograd. The appeal was sent out by the *Nation* to a number of leaders of thought in England, among them H. G. Wells, Bishop Gore, John Galsworthy, G. M. Trevelyan, Lord Haldane, and G. Bernard Shaw, for comment and criticism. The responses were almost unanimous in expressing agreement with the proposals set forth.

The undersigned, members of the Russian Group of Intellectual Workers, and belonging to different shades of political and social opinion, after having witnessed the course of events in Russia during these latter years, have combined to apply our knowledge and our energies to restore the productive capacity of our country, and to preserve the little culture which has survived the world war and the Revolution. We now appeal to the public opinion of Europe and America and to our compatriots in exile, in order to point out to them the road it is necessary to follow so as to restore as quickly as possible the economic power of the people and to bring about the resumption of economic relations between Russia and Western Europe. The Revolution which has lasted for more than two years has destroyed the foundations of the old regime, and is seeking fresh forms of political and social life, and these changes have inevitably been accompanied by excesses. This movement has reacted on the whole world, which after this unexampled war stands in need of peace and the means of culture indispensable to the establishment of a new organization in Russia. These are the reasons why, as it seems to us, the directing classes in other countries should aim at the reconstruction in Russia of a stable political and economic order.

While foreign help is indispensable in the economic sphere, and in that of Russian production, a question which affects the interests of the entire world, there is a danger in foreign, and particularly armed, intervention in the internal politics of a people of 150 millions. In this sphere the people itself, at the cost of suffering and conflict, must reorganize its new life; for, undoubtedly, methods of violence yield no positive result, and are usually the source of new sufferings for a revolutionary nation, for they imperil the last remains of civilization.

Admitting this, it is still indispensable that our compatriots, who have been exiled from Russia for two years, should reconsider their beliefs and their opinions, which no longer correspond to the actual interests of the country, nor to the mentality and beliefs of the Russian masses, nor, in particular, to the views of those numerous groups of intellectuals whose opinions have been sensibly modified during the course of these latter months, in which days and hours seemed like years. One must undoubtedly strongly condemn the excesses which have taken place in Russia, but these negative facts temporary as they are must not separate Russian intellectuals from the Russian people, whose sufferings should be lightened by concessions and by personal sacrifices.

The political and economic state of Russia is clearly difficult. Russia stands in need of the creation of a new order, without which civilized life is impossible, and she needs economic reforms and conditions favorable to the development of her energies.

It is impossible to foresee what direction the revolutionary process will take later on; what ideas will finally triumph, and what changes will take place in the psychology of the people, and for that reason it is all the more difficult to influence these changes by means of violence.

The one salient point of the Russian question is as follows: It is impossible to go on isolating this gigantic country from the rest of the world till it has settled its economic and social problems. The interests of Russia and of other countries do not permit this, and the actual situation requires:

1. That all armed intervention in the internal affairs of Russia should cease;
2. That business and intellectual relations with Russia should be resumed, irrespective of the existing regime;
3. That a process of free cooperation should be set up with the Russian people for the restoration of their economic, material, and intellectual forces.

Profoundly convinced that Russia will survive all her difficulties and will establish a new civilized life, we are persuaded that the leaders of public opinion in Europe will look with sympathy on our hopes, will respond to our appeal, and will assist the Russian people in their efforts to return to the path of peaceful labor.

(Signed) THE FOUNDERS OF THE UNION OF INTELLECTUAL WORKERS

To the Young Soldiers of France

THROUGHOUT the war Paul Vaillant-Couturier served in the French army, was three times wounded, was cited in an army order and many times decorated, and was elected to the French Chamber of Deputies last autumn when he was twenty-seven years old. He is a lawyer and author, and a Socialist. In the *Populaire* (Paris) of April 23, he published an appeal "To Soldier-Comrades." A Royalist deputy, M. Magne, denounced his article in the Chamber on April 26 as an "appeal to military indiscipline" and a "crime against the country." The Minister of Justice, M. Lhopiteau, replied that the Government had started an investigation and would prosecute. Thereupon the *Humanité*, the official daily of the French Socialist Party, reprinted the article on April 28, over the signatures of the sixty-seven Socialist members of Parliament, denounced the Government's attitude as a crime against freedom of the press and the right of electors to be represented as they saw fit, and declared that the sixty-seven—which included Albert Thomas, director of the Labor Office of the League of Nations—accepted joint responsibility with Vaillant-Couturier. Later, the Executive Committee of the Republican Association of ex-Service Men, headed by Henri Barbusse, took the same action. The article read in part:

. . . Young comrades, soldiers just enrolled who left home with the usual celebrations, with your noisy comrades, a trumpet, a flag, a crowd of small boys—faint echo of the enthusiastic departures of August, 1914—you have a right to know for what tasks you are destined.

You are destined to sow the seeds of war. The assassinations at Frankfurt and the occupation of the neutral zone did more for the cause of German revenge than would have been accomplished in twenty years of propaganda by adroit pan-Germans. The government which, under the pretext of forcing respect for a still-born treaty, is today seeking to crush the pacifist revolution in Germany, and which, pretending to crush German militarism, strengthens it, is a government of treason.

It is an old story but it needs repeating.

Every new vexation imposed upon the German people is a new victory against France won by Marshal Foch. . . .

And you, soldiers of the overseas expeditions—there will be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than 200,000 of you—army of counter-revolution and of rapine, crusaders for an imperious Vatican, poor massacrers and massacred in Morocco, Cilicia, Syria—you have a right to know to what pillage and subjugation of peoples the ambition of French militarism, finance, and clericalism is leading you.

And you, finally, troops of the metropolitan army, cavalry, and machine-gunners of the tanks—you cannot be unaware of the work reserved for you. You and the colored troops are the sole hope of a bourgeoisie which feels the tide of revolutionary truth mounting. It counts on your youth and your servility. Incapable of maintaining itself longer in power or of saving France by any policy, it will, when its hour sounds, command you to load arms and fire. That is the great and horrid secret of its opposition to disarmament.

Dying regimes always seek to surround their funerals with bloody libations. Soldiers, comrades, the question is not simply whether you will mutiny when that time comes; it is whether you understand what is in the interest of the country that you love. You must know whether you want your country to be truly yours, whether you want your labor to be yours, whether you want peace and disarmament of hearts across the world to be a reality, or whether you want the fraternal blood of workers and peasants to flow for the greater joy of the profiteers of death.

The gesture of your comrades of the class of 1918 [who mutinied at Versailles] will be a great lesson to you. In the months that come, try to heed their counsels. They will recall that last year, when the fists and clubs and sabers of the Parisian police forced the socialist crowd against the barrage of poilus stationed in the Place de la Madeleine with bayonets fixed, ready to charge, the pale ranks of the soldiers opened before the red flags and the guns were turned skyward.

Training for Authorship

How to write, what to write, and where to sell.

Dr. Esenwein

Cultivate your mind. Develop your literary gifts. Master the art of self-expression. Make your spare time profitable. Turn your ideas into dollars.

Courses in Short-Story Writing, Versification, Journalism, Play Writing, Photoplay Writing, etc., taught personally by Dr. J. Berg Esenwein, for many years editor of Lippincott's Magazine, and a staff of literary experts. Constructive criticism. Frank, honest, helpful advice. *Real teaching.*

One pupil has received over $5,000 for stories and articles written mostly in spare time—"play work," he calls it. Another pupil received over $1,000 before completing her first course. Another, a busy wife and mother, is averaging over $75 a week from photoplay writing alone.

There is no other institution or agency doing so much for writers, young or old. The universities recognize this, for over one hundred members of the English faculties of higher institutions are studying in our Literary Department. The editors recognize it, for they are constantly recommending our courses.

We publish *The Writer's Library*, 13 volumes; descriptive booklet free. We also publish *The Writer's Monthly*, the leading magazine for literary workers; sample copy 20 cents, annual subscription $2.00. Besides our teaching service, we offer a manuscript criticism service.

150-Page illustrated catalogue free. *Please Address*

The Home Correspondence School
Dept. 79 Springfield, Mass.
ESTABLISHED 1897 INCORPORATED 1904

City ... at Leipzig

GERMAN CITY BONDS

offer to-day unusual investment possibilities. They can now be bought for a fraction of their nominal value. Germany has the power to pay and the interest on these bonds is being paid steadily. There is no doubt in the minds of the world that Germany's exchange will return to normal with consequent profit to bondholders.

Correspondence Solicited

von Polenz & Co. Inc.
60 Broadway, New York

Boston Philadelphia Milwaukee Denver Berlin, Germany

ISIS

International Quarterly Devoted to the History of Science and Civilization

Edited by
George Sarton and Charles Singer

Each number contains an editorial, original contributions, shorter notes, reviews of the most important books and chiefly a Critical Bibliography of the publications relating to the History and Philosophy of Science and the History of Civilization.

Books and papers on the medical and biological sciences should be sent to Charles Singer, Westbury Lodge, Oxford, England; all others to George Sarton, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.

Vol. I., 50 Belgian francs; Vols. II. and III., each 30 francs. Ed. de luxe from Vol. II. on, each Vol. 50 francs. The subscription to Vol. III. (about 500 pages) is open.

Those who believe in the New Humanism should subscribe to "Isis."

PUBLISHER:
Weissenbruch, Imprimeur du roi
49 rue du Poincon Brussels, Belgium

A Cooperative Print Shop

offers the best assurance that work will have prompt, intelligent handling, and that costs will be lower than in other shops giving an equal service and equal quality.

The Nation Press is a complete cooperative democracy where each worker, from the skilled journeyman to the messenger boy, is interested in pleasing the customer.

THE NATION PRESS, INC.
20 VESEY STREET *Telephone 9092 Barclay* NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED